

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY



131 205

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY





# THE DEBATER'S GUIDE

REVISED *and* ENLARGED

By

JOHN H. ARNOLD

HANDY BOOK CORPORATION  
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA



•

**Copyright, 1923**  
**Handy Book Corporation**

•

# CONTENTS

## PART ONE

CHAPTER	PAGE
I DEBATING .....	11
Importance and Value of Debating	
Know the Subject	
Setting Out for a Definite Goal	
Proof	
Assertion	
Use of Authorities	
Refutation	
Centering Argument	
Submerging One's Self in the Subject	
Fairness in Debate	
Terms Used in Debating	
II THE QUESTION .....	35
Selecting the Question Deserves Careful Thought	
Questions Not Suitable for Debate	
Debatable Propositions	
Wording of Proposition	
Clear Statement	
Definition of Terms	
Agreeing on a Basis for Disagreement	
III ARGUMENTS: KINDS, USES AND VALUE: WHAT TO AVOID .....	45
Many Kinds of Arguments Available	
Good Debate Includes Various Types	
Exposition in Argumentation	
Authorities	
Analogy	
Inductive Argument	
Deductive Argument	
Logic in Argument	

CHAPTER	PAGE
Cause and Effect	
Rebuttal	
Counter Proposals	
Humor	
What to Avoid	

## PART TWO

IV	PREPARATION AND PRESENTATION.....	73
	Presentation Dependent on Preparation	
	Mechanical Aids	
	The First Step in Preparation	
	Collecting Material	
	Studying Both Sides of the Proposition	
	Analyzing the Proposition	
	Organizing the Material	
	Determining the Issues	
V	THE BRIEF AND ITS DEVELOPMENT.....	111
	Introduction	
	The Issues	
	Preparing the Discussion from the Brief	

## PART THREE

VI	MODEL ARGUMENTS .....	147
	Expository Argument	
	Exposition to Clear Ground	
	Burke's Use of Exposition	
	Argument by Authority	
	Refutation by Use of Authority	
	Analogy	
	Fallacy Shown	
	Analogy Used in Refutation	
	Lincoln's Method of Strengthening Debate by Admit- ting Points	
	Admitting Opponent's Argument	
	Deductive Argument	
	Begging the Question	

# CONTENTS

5

CHAPTER	PAGE
Inductive Argument	
Cause and Effect	
Turning the Tables	

## VII ARGUMENTS FOR SPECIAL STUDY ..... 191

Chatham on Colonial Taxation	
Otis on the Writs of Assistance	
Argument in the Monroe Doctrine	
Reasoning in Supreme Court Decision	
Fourteen Miscellaneous Arguments Covering Various Topics	

## PART FOUR

## VIII DEBATABLE PROPOSITIONS CLASSIFIED..... 229

Political	
Immigration and Citizenship	
International	
Educational	
Social	
Labor	
Economic	
National Defense	
Miscellaneous	

## PART FIVE

## IX PROS AND CONS, WITH REFERENCES..... 253

Introduction	
Propositions Considered	
Immigration Restrictions Lessened	
Japanese and Chinese Citizenship	
Soldier Bonus	
Cancellation of Allied War Debt	
Monroe Doctrine	
National Defenses	
Disarmament	
The World Court	
St. Lawrence Waterway Project	

CHAPTER	PAGE
Revision of Prohibition Law	
Closed Shop	
Subsidizing the Merchant Marine	
Ownership of Railroads	
Railway Labor Board Decisions	
Issuing of Tax Exempt Bonds	
Single Tax	
Muscle Shoals Project	
Federal Department of Education	
Ku Klux Klan	
Cabinet Form of Government	
Election of President by Direct Vote	
Direct Primary	
Recall of Judges	
Capital Punishment	
Mothers' Pensions	
Moving Pictures	
Minimum Wages	

## PREFACE

This revised and enlarged edition of *The Debater's Guide* is the result of ten years' experience as corresponding advisor to high school and college debating clubs throughout the United States, to instructors interested in debating in the grades, and to individuals trying to get more out of their forensic efforts. The material included in this book supplies in one volume the information requested in several hundred letters. The problems confronting a long list of correspondents, the writer believes, are typical of the problems of all who are interested in making debating worth while.

The first edition of *The Debater's Guide* appeared in 1916 as a 64-page pamphlet. Words of commendation have encouraged the writer to prepare this second edition in response to numerous requests for something more extensive and with later reference material. Acknowledgment is given to all who have, in any way, influenced the development of the book by friendly suggestions.

JOHN H. ARNOLD.

Cedar Falls, Iowa.

July 18, 1923.



•

# PART ONE



## The Fundamentals of Debating

•





## CHAPTER I

### DEBATING

Argumentation is older than history and has a vital place in the every day lives of human beings. Down through the centuries men have "reasoned together," and though they have not always arrived at the same conclusions, nevertheless the reasoning has had much to do with the advancement of civilization.

Debating is one of the most important subjects taught in our modern schools, and because of its importance should be emphasized more than it is. It is one of the best means known for the development of the powers of expression and clear thinking. It develops telic thinking—thinking to a purpose, and gives one training in thought co-ordination and experience in presenting thoughts for the consideration of others.

No one can accomplish much in life without the ability to convince others, no matter what line of activity one may follow as a life work. The lawyer, the minister and the salesman are not the only ones who must depend on their ability in this respect to gain them a livelihood. Convincing others or being convinced is the common lot of all humanity.

Conviction may be a good thing or it may be a tragedy, depending upon whether the one who does the convincing is right. His reasoning may be at fault even though he may be sincere in his beliefs. The majority of failures in life are due to faulty reasoning. People have not learned to arrive at logical conclusions; sometimes by making faulty deductions, sometimes by looking at only a small portion of the proposition, people make decisions which are sure to result in disappointment.

No matter whether we express our thoughts before an audience or through the printed page, or whether we crystalize those thoughts into a statute, a field of growing grain, an aeroplane, a wireless telephone, a Panama Canal, an industrial enterprise, or something else, we must make decisions for ourselves, and if we are to succeed, those decisions must follow logical reasoning.

The debater learns to reason and is thus better fitted to make a success of life even though he may never appear before an audience to make a speech after he graduates from school. In this connection we must recognize the difference between the debater and the one who goes through the formality of taking part in a debate. There is a distinct difference, and it is one of the objectives of this book to help develop real debaters.

Debating may be included in school entertainments, but it should no more be regarded as a purely entertaining feature of school activity than arithmetic or reading. It is a vital educational factor deserving of a place in every school, and when it is given the prominence that it deserves the modern schools will be of larger service.

### **When to Begin Debating**

Pupils in the fifth and sixth grades sometimes present very creditable debates, but usually they require so much help from their teacher or some other source that they derive little benefit from their effort. Seventh and eighth grade or junior high school pupils are able to do effective debating when propositions are selected for them which are in keeping with their mental capacities. The work should begin early and continue as a regular part of the school activity.

In colleges there may be reasons which make it expedient to excuse students from taking part in forensic encounters, but this should certainly not be done in the high school or in the upper grades if debating is taken up at that time.

All should have a part so that all may get the benefit rather than a few. In the old-time ciphering matches the one who excelled was the one who got the most experience. Those whom he vanquished dropped out of the race. Later educa-

tors recognized that this was not a good method. The wise instructor now has the victor drop out while the vanquished continues. Thus instead of the one who does not need the drill being in the foreground, the one who needs it most gets the benefit. The same principle applies in respect to debating. The one who does not make a good showing should be given more training than those who are more proficient. The poor student in history, language or some other subject is given extra help or required to give the subject more attention. The poor student in debating should likewise be given more experience instead of being excused from taking any part at all.

### **Know the Subject**

Before a debate is possible it is necessary to select a question, but since a chapter is devoted to the question it will not be taken up at this time.

Whatever may be the proposition for discussion it is necessary to know the subject.

Too often students have just a smattering of information which they use as a foundation for long speeches, the weakness of the discussion being evidence that they need informing themselves rather than attempting to inform others.

Study, study, study, are three rules which everyone should persistently follow in preparing for the final test with an opponent.

There can be no consistent organization of material until one is thoroughly familiar with every phase of the subject. For example, if the debate should be on the admission of Chinese immigration it is essential that one should become familiar with the early history of the subject. When did the first Chinese immigrants come to this country? Why did they come? What was the effect? When did the first opposition to their coming manifest itself and why? When did the United States first take action against this immigration and why? Was that action wise at the time? If so, have conditions so changed that exclusion is no longer a good policy? In what way have conditions changed, how are they the same? Do new elements enter into the matter, and if so, what are they? These and many other questions need to be taken into consideration if one is to get a thorough understanding of the proposition to be discussed.

The debater needs to be familiar with the historical background and needs to determine the issues involved. How is it possible to know what arguments the opponent will use? Very frequently a debater is surprised by the argument which the opponent presents. Such a surprise is evidence of a lack of preparation. To know the subject and to have analyzed it carefully and logically so that all the issues involved have been discov-

ered is to be proof against surprise. The one who can clearly set forth the issues can hold his opponent to those issues and any other discussion is beside the point, being absolutely irrelevant.

Recently the president of a railroad company, in a letter to a United States Senator, in reference to a speech which the latter had made, called the Senator's attention to the fact that the said Senator was not familiar with his subject; he had not based his speech on the facts of the case; he had failed to strike at the real issues of the matter, and consequently what he had said could have no weight with thinking people. Talking without first getting correct information is an all too common practice in American life, all the way from the loafers' corner in the backwoods village to the United States Senate.

The debater should be sure of himself, know his subject, determine the issues involved and talk on those issues, holding his opponent to the line that has been marked out. Determining the real issues is important, for it is very easy to fall into error in this respect. In considering the advisability of granting independence to the Philippines one may consider the possibility of Japanese aggression and ask the question, Would there be danger of the islands falling into the hands of the Japanese? concluding that this is a real issue involved. One who would hold to that as an issue

might think he was proving that independence was not advisable by proving that the islands would in all probability fall into the hands of the Japanese. The opponent might accept the latter proof, but show that the Japanese phase was not a real issue by showing that the islands would be better off in the hands of the Japanese than under the control of America. It would be difficult for an American to accept such argument as sound from the standpoint of Philippine welfare, but it would not be for a Japanese. This illustration shows the necessity of getting at the real issues. The possibility of Japanese aggression is, naturally, involved in the Philippine independence proposition by reason of the vast amount of discussion pro and con that has been centered on this matter by public and private individuals through the press and otherwise. It should not be ignored by the debater, nor should the mistake be made that this is one of the issues on which must hinge the decision of the judge.

There is a fallacy, not quite so common in recent years as it was at one time, of thinking that all debates must be based on the three issues: Is it practical? Is it desirable? Is it necessary? The practical and desirable features are essential, but the matter of necessity is somewhat difficult to determine. Certain action may be expedient without being necessary. It may be expedient to grant



independence to the Philippines, but it is not necessary, either, from the standpoint of the Filipinos or of America. In discussing the cancellation of the allied war debt the affirmative may hold that cancellation is absolutely necessary to the welfare of Europe while the negative holds just as strongly to the point that exacting payment is just as necessary to the welfare of the United States. There are times when a debate may largely hinge on the three phases of practicability, desirability and necessity, but one must look deeper to discover the real issues involved. There is no set program to be followed in preparing all argumentative discussions, one must be governed by the question at hand. If one chooses to be governed by a single principle, it should be this, Know the subject and make the discussion fit the particular proposition.

### **Setting Out for a Definite Goal**

It would be a very unwise ship captain who would lift his anchor and put out to sea with no objective. He would doubtless get somewhere, but the chances are that it would not be where he wanted to be when he got there. People must know beforehand where they are going if they are not to be disappointed. It is difficult enough to reach a goal when that goal is definitely determined, without suffering the further handicap of indecision. People who "have ears and hear not"

are no more to be condemned than those who talk much but say nothing.

There is always aimless talking unless the speaker is aiming at something. Those who start for nowhere get nowhere. The debater needs to determine what he is going to set out to accomplish, and in presenting his discussion he should not keep the audience in the dark. The speaker who knows what he is going to try to accomplish, who points out the goal to his hearers and who tells them what road he is going to follow, is then ready to drive straight toward the goal with reasonably good chances of reaching it.

Speaking to fill in about so much time is tiresome to an audience, while the speaker gets little or no benefit from his discourse. Knowing the subject, determining the issues and co-ordinating the material enables one to definitely set out for some goal. The good salesman who makes a fortune from his profession while others scarcely make a living has learned to aim definitely and shape his selling talk to the one objective in mind. The minister who is sought after instead of seeking a parish has learned to co-ordinate his thoughts and make every sermon a landmark of goal achievement. Webster's Reply to Hayne is a masterpiece in argumentation. Not once was the speaker in doubt as to his objective. He knew ex-

actly what he wanted to accomplish and from the first words of his discussion he drove straight to the point.

Webster understood the folly of aimless wandering. In the opening paragraph of his famous speech he said: "When the mariner has been tossed for many days in thick weather and on an unknown sea, he naturally avails himself of the first pause in the storm, the earliest glance of the sun, to take his latitude and ascertain how far the elements have driven him from his true course. Let us imitate this prudence, and, before we float further on the waves of this debate, refer to the point from which we departed, that we may at least be able to conjecture where we now are."

Burke in his speech "On Conciliation With America" clearly set forth in the introduction what he aimed to accomplish. He said: "The proposition is peace. Not peace through the medium of war; not peace to be hunted through the labyrinth of intricate and endless negotiations; not peace to arise out of universal discord fomented, from principle, in all parts of the Empire; not peace to depend on the juridical determination of perplexing questions, or the precise marking the shadowy boundaries of a complex government. It is simple peace, sought in its natural course, and in its ordinary haunts. It is peace sought in the spirit of peace, and laid in principles purely

specific. I propose, by removing the ground of the difference, and by restoring the former unsuspecting confidence of the Colonies in the Mother Country, to give permanent satisfaction to your people." Burke set out to accomplish something by his speech, and time has demonstrated the wisdom manifested in his discourse.

Not every great speech has achieved the results desired by the speaker, but every great speech has its definite objective. While the purposeful discourse may not accomplish its purpose, it is absolutely true that the discourse without a definite objective accomplishes nothing. The one who aims for a certain goal may not reach it, but certain it is that the one who does not aim definitely gets nowhere.

### **The First Speaker**

The first speaker should outline the subject, define any terms that need defining, present the issues to be considered and set forth the aims of the affirmative side. When there are two or more speakers on each side every speech is important, but the first is perhaps the most important of all since it establishes the foundation for the entire debate, providing that the speaker is clear on the issues involved.

The definition of terms should be agreed upon previously so there can be no quibbling. The

practice of exchanging briefs is commendable, as then each side knows the basis on which the other proposes to build argument, and if there is any disagreement over issues, this can be straightened out before the actual debate takes place. There is no reasonable excuse to be offered for not agreeing on the definition of terms. As to the agreement of issues previous to the time of the debate, this is not so essential since the determining of issues is a part of the subject analysis, and the one who is better at analyzing a proposition than his opponent may legitimately hold this advantage. Whether an agreement on issues has been made before the debate or not, the first speaker should present the issues at least as he recognizes them in his own mind. It is the privilege of the opponent to disagree in this respect as well as any other, but he needs to be sure that if he does disagree he can make it clear to the audience that his analysis of the proposition is superior to the analysis of the other. The negative should not hesitate to take exception to the presentation of issues made by the affirmative if there is a legitimate reason for doing so.

In closing, the speaker should briefly summarize what he has accomplished, being certain that he has actually accomplished what he claims to have done.

### **Proof**

The statement is often made that "the burden of proof rests with the affirmative." The affirmative sustains the proposition, but this does not excuse the negative from making every effort to show wherein the position of the affirmative is not justified.

The law says that the prisoner before the bar of justice is innocent until he is proven guilty. The State must prove its case, nevertheless the accused makes every possible effort to prove his innocence. The burden of proof rests with the State as the affirmative supporting the proposition that the prisoner is guilty, but the prisoner is not content with picking flaws in the contention of the State. He seeks to actually prove his innocence.

The burden of proof rests with the affirmative as the contender in the case, but the negative must furnish evidence to show wherein the conclusions and contentions of the affirmative are wrong. The negative needs to build a chain of evidence as well as to pick flaws in the links of the chain forged by the opposing side.

### **Assertions**

Very frequently unsupported assertions are offered as proof. A mere statement is not sufficient. What is there back of that statement? What is there to justify it? The statement has

often been made that the allied war debt should be cancelled because the allies cannot pay. Merely saying that the allies are unable to pay is not proof, and has no weight with the consistent judge of a debate or in molding public opinion. In fact, the unsupported statement has an unfavorable reaction. Why can not the allies pay? the public asks. If they can not pay now, why not later? If not all, why not at least a part? If they can not pay interest and principal, can they not eventually pay at least the principal? During a college debate on the question of allied debt cancellation, one negative speaker made the assertion that the debts could be paid because subjects of the allied countries held more than enough American securities to meet the debt obligation. The affirmative showed that this assertion was not proof by asking how those securities were to be obtained for the purpose of paying the debts of the respective governments.

Facts should be stated as such, and evidence given to show that they are actually facts and not the opinions of the speaker. Conclusions drawn from facts at hand should be presented as such and the reasons given why those conclusions seem to be justified. To present a conclusion arrived at through the reasoning process as the final word that can be said on the matter is presumptuous and

is more apt to create an unfavorable impression on the audience than to convince.

### Use of Authorities

The use of authorities is not only permissible, but advisable. They should always be quoted exactly. If a statement by an authority is long, a summary may be made, stating that it is a summary. In quoting, the speaker should use not only the name of the authority, he should also state where the quotation may be found.

If convenient, it is very effective to produce the book, magazine, letter, or whatever one may be quoting from. To be able to turn to the source promptly creates a good impression on the audience and adds force to what the speaker may say on the subject.

Care needs to be taken in the selection of authorities. A traveler has been to the Philippines. He returns to America and writes of his impressions concerning the school system which has been fostered by the American government. All he knows about the system is what he has observed himself. Manifestly this traveler could not be accepted as an authority, for what he says is mere opinion; it is not known whether he has gotten a comprehensive view of the situation or whether he has seen but a small part and has concluded that the whole is the same as the portion



that he has seen. His writings could not be accepted as authoritative, especially if his statements should differ from the official report sent out by the Philippine Director of Education.

The speaker may be satisfied that the authority he wishes to use is correct in what he says, but he needs to be sure that this authority was placed in a position to know the facts of the case. The speaker should use an authority that is generally recognized as such. It is very embarrassing to have an authority questioned by the opposing side.

### **Refutation**

The time to refute argument cannot be definitely settled by any principle that will apply to all propositions. The rebuttal argument is concerned with refutation, but ordinarily it is advisable to refute argument in the constructive speeches. The first speaker, without knowing what the opponent will say, may anticipate by showing what arguments the opponent must consistently use and then refute those arguments. A position taken by an opponent should be answered in the following constructive speech or the audience begins to think that it can not be answered, and this impression grows until it is difficult to overcome when an answer is attempted in the rebuttal speech.

The debater must use his own judgment as to the time for refuting argument. He should, how-

ever, introduce rebuttal material whenever this may seem to strengthen his position.

### **Centering Argument**

The reason why a rifle is more powerful than a shot gun is because it centers its energy on a given point while a shot gun scatters.

The efficient debater centers his force rather than talking at random or trying to sustain many issues. It is preferable to center on a few issues, and build the argument around those than to use the same argument in an attempt to sustain several issues. The possibility of Japanese aggression may be used effectively as argument in support of an issue, but to make it an issue weakens the debate.

To hold the attention of the audience to three or four main points which the affirmative is attempting to prove is a possibility, but it is confusing when the argument is so divided that several points seem to have equal value. The "practical, desirable, necessary" type of discussion has the advantage that it centers the debate on three points providing the speaker does not break these up into many parts. No one can keep the mind of his audience centered on a proposition unless he shows by the co-ordination of thoughts that his own mind is centered on it.

Careful analysis is an aid to concentration of argument, for through analysis one is able to determine the points for attack.

### **Submerging One's Self in the Subject**

There are many orators who have a reputation for oratory, but who do not succeed in getting people to act on their suggestions because they center the attention of the audience to themselves rather than on what they say.

A presidential convention was once carried off its feet by the wonderful presentation of a speech, the speaker was nominated as the candidate of a leading party for president, but the election was not held until after the country concluded that the power of oratory rather than the wisdom of words was a large factor in causing the nomination to be made. There are some fine speakers in the ministry who do not succeed in building up their churches because the man stands out rather than his message. There are other ministers who attract less attention to themselves, but who succeed in building up their churches because they hold the attention of the people to the message.

It is said that one is well dressed when he is so dressed that no one notices his clothes. The same principle applies to a debater. He is a good debater when he is so submerged in his subject that the audience sees the subject instead of him-

self. The proposition presented is the thing, not the speaker. Any peculiarities which one has that attracts more than ordinary attention should be corrected, any temptations to indulge in flights of oratory suppressed.

### **Sincerity**

An audience is quick to detect any lack of sincerity. The speaker who is trying to win the decision of the judge merely for the sake of winning is very apt to reveal his true motives in his discourse.

"This is a personal letter to you," says the writer of a form letter mailed in an unsealed envelope, and before we read any farther we are prejudiced against what may follow because we have detected one note of insincerity.

Such glaring manifestations are not common in debating, but very frequently it is evident that the debater is not sincere. He may be trying to convince others against his own convictions. He may not believe in the side of the proposition which he is upholding. It is possible for one to have an open mind on a question which will enable him to take up either side and defend it effectively after thorough study, but if one has definitely made up his mind on a question it is a poor policy to attempt to defend the other side, except for practice work.

### **Fairness**

Closely related to sincerity is general fairness. One should be fair in all respects, fair to the audience and fair to the opponent.

The speaker should give his audience credit for being intelligent and for being reasonably well informed on subjects of the day of general interest to the public. A patronizing air that seems to say "If you will listen I will instruct you in this matter, for my knowledge is superior to yours," prevents the speaker winning a fair hearing. The attitude of "Let us reason together" puts speaker and audience on the same level and insures a fair hearing at least even though there may be a difference of opinion at the end.

It is unwise to assume the attitude of "I am right and those who do not agree with me are wrong." The speaker should not do more than assert his confidence that he is right and attempt to convince his hearers that his confidence is justified.

Being fair with the audience is a demand that every debater should place upon himself, and he should be even more certain that he is absolutely fair with his opponent. Every debater naturally wants to win the decision of the judge, and he should have that desire, but to be prompted to resort to trickery to win a decision is as despicable as to gum an opponent's shoe during a basketball

game. One should have sufficient self respect to refrain from resorting to any unfair means in order to win.

Citing authorities is a common method of not being exactly fair. Quoting just enough to serve one's purpose when to give a quotation in full would place a different meaning on what the authority has said is little short of deliberate lying. No authority should be quoted without giving enough of his statement to make his meaning clear. If this means an advantage to the opponent, omit the quotation entirely. Misquoting is a very ordinary occurrence even among speakers who have no intention of being unfair, there being a lack of recognition of the principles involved in the citation of authorities. Deliberate attempts of trying to turn a quotation to one's advantage are encountered occasionally.

Should a debater encounter an opponent who is unfair there is nothing to be gained by accusing him of having wrong designs. The accuser usually places himself in as unfavorable a position as the accused. A better plan is to not assume that the opponent is unfair, but rather to show that he is mistaken. To call an opponent a liar, no matter in how modest terms one may couch the accusation, and no matter what may be the provocation, does not help one's standing with his hearers. It may be argued in opposition to what has just

3

been said that Webster's Reply to Hayne contained vituperative outbursts, but a careful study of his speech and of its influence will scarcely warrant the presumption that Webster gained anything by such outbursts.

An accusation invites a counter attack, while assuming that the opponent is sincere and yet mistaken is to maintain one's dignity and at the same time effectively undermine the foundation on which the argument of the opponent rests. If it can be shown that his judgment is faulty or that he has fallen into error is to discount the force of everything that he has said; while to attack his integrity is to bring upon one's self the unpopularity that falls to the lot of every accuser. There is always the possibility that the opponent is sincere but mistaken irrespective of the amount of evidence that seems to point to his unfair methods. To be fair with the opponent never costs anything except brain energy in striving to meet his arguments, and it does give one the big advantage of keeping the good will of the audience and his own self-respect. To drop to the level of wrangling with an opponent over his integrity is to divert mental effort that can better be used to some other purpose. No one but a master debater can afford to do it, and he accomplishes nothing by it.

Know the subject; analyze it carefully; determine the real issues, separating the issues from

the sub-points that may come under these; set out to accomplish a definite objective; keep the argument centered on the issues set forth; keep the proposition in the foreground; be fair at all times. These are principles which the careful debater must not overlook. Debating is far too important to be treated lightly.

### **Terms Used in Debating**

The following are some of the common debating terms:

**Analogy**—Argument which draws conclusions regarding a particular case by reference to another particular case.

**Affirmative**—The side which maintains the proposition.

**Argument**—A reason or reasons offered to prove a point.

**Argumentation**—The act of forming reasons, making deductions, drawing conclusions and applying them to the case under discussion.

**Brief**—An outline guide to help the debater co-ordinate his material.

**Constructive Speech**—A speech which builds up the argument or evidence.

**Contention**—A point maintained in an argument; a line of argument taken to support or deny the proposition.



**Deductive Argument**—Drawing conclusions regarding a particular case through the application of a general law.

**Evidence**—That which proves or tends to prove a contention.

**Fallacy**—An argument, or apparent argument, which professes to prove a point at issue while in reality it does not.

**Inductive Argument**—The arriving at a general law by observing particulars.

**Issue**—A point in a debate on which argument must hinge. The issues involved are the points upon which decisions must be based.

**Negative**—The side which denies the proposition.

**Proposition**—The question or resolution as stated.

**Rebuttal**—The giving of evidence to destroy the effect of evidence presented by the opponent.

**Refutation**—The process of disproving.

## CHAPTER II

### THE QUESTION

The proposition for discussion has much to do with the success of the debate. Selecting the question deserves careful thought, taking into consideration whether the debate is to be staged by beginners, high school students, or college students with a long debating experience. A question suitable for one is not for the other.

Beginning debaters have long talked about who was the greater, Washington or Lincoln. "Talked about" is the proper term to use for the actual debating of such a question is an impossibility. Washington and Lincoln lived in different times; they had different problems to solve, and it is beyond the ability of anyone to prove that either one or the other was greater. Greatness is but a relative term and at best only comparisons can be made. This trite proposition may bring about a character study of these two leading men of American history, but such a study is more properly the function of the essay or oration rather than the debate. The purpose of a debate is to deal with issues rather than characters, and it is in dealing with issues that the debate becomes worthwhile.

Such propositions as, *Resolved*, That Washington's Early Hardships Helped Him Win Success in Later Life; or, War in Washington's Time was Preferable to Peace and Submission to Great Britain, are both debatable and suitable to upper grade pupils although the latter proposition is somewhat difficult. The first appeals to boys' awakening spirit of hero worship, while the second causes pupils to begin to think seriously.

In the high school such propositions as the following are appropriate: *Resolved*, That the Tariff Should Protect the Farmer as well as the Manufacturer; *Resolved*, That the President Should Be Elected for a Term of Six Years and Made Ineligible to Succeed Himself; *Resolved*, That the President Should Be Elected by the Direct Vote of the People; *Resolved*, That Advertising Is in the Interests of National Economy; *Resolved*, That Mother's Pensions Are Appropriate.

*Resolved*, That the Abuse of the Free Press Makes it Desirable for the Federal Government to Pass Legislation Providing for Stringent Modification; or, *Resolved*, That a Federal Department of Education Should Be Created with the Head of that Department a Member of the President's Cabinet, are questions appropriate for college debates while high school students are not sufficiently mature to grasp the significance of the propo-

sitions. While it is not as grievous an error to have students debate propositions beyond their capacity to fully comprehend as it is to take up questions requiring no real thought, nevertheless propositions should be kept within the debater's comprehensive ability to get the best results. This subject was taken up briefly by the writer in an article on "How to Make Debating Worth While," published in the October, 1921, edition of *Popular Educator*.

The questions given in the Pros and Cons section of this book and in the special list of 250 debatable propositions reveal the wide range of subject matter available. Many of these propositions will doubtless suggest others. There are questions suitable for grade pupils, others desirable for high school debates, and still others that require the mature mind of the advanced college student to do them justice. In fact, some problems presented are beyond the wisdom of the leading statesmen of the world, nevertheless they can be taken up and the students at least become more familiar with the issues involved and get a better general understanding of the problem. The subjects listed in this book are designed to help in the selection of others as well as to give propositions that may be discussed just as they are worded. No debating club will choose to indefinitely follow a

suggested list of debate subjects, and it is essential that certain principles be observed in deciding on a proposition.

The question should not be so complex that it is beyond the comprehension of those who are to discuss it, neither should it be so simple that it requires little thought.

It sometimes happens that students will work long and faithfully only to discover that they have a subject that is not debatable. There may be no basis for the forming of argument in defense of or in opposition to a definite issue or issues. How could one analyze and determine the issues for such a proposition as, *Resolved*, That Art is More Pleasing to the Eye than Nature? It is easy to talk about anything, but when it comes to organizing material for a real debate, it is not so easy. Unless live issues are involved it is useless to attempt a debate.

Next in importance to the selecting of the proposition is the wording. The statement should be clear and concise, any tendency toward ambiguity eliminated. The proposition should contain a statement of that which is to be discussed, no more and no less. It is not easy to determine a wording that meets all the needs, but it is essential that this be done or the debate will become no more than a wrangling contest over what

was intended to be discussed. Sometimes a question is so stated that the affirmative can do little more than say it is true, while the negative replies it is not, and neither have a basis for showing that they have come to the given conclusions by any process of reasoning.

A proposition may be so worded that it limits discussion until there is little left to discuss. Again it may be so broad that it can not be covered in the time allowed for the argument. Suppose that the question for debate should be the annexation of Mexico to the United States. The proposition might be worded, *Resolved*, That Mexico Should Be Annexed to the United States. This is a broad wording and would allow the debater to take up the proposition from many angles. Both affirmative and negative could argue the matter from their standpoint and scarcely get together on issues. There are too many things involved to dispose of such a question within the time limits of an ordinary debate. But should the statement be limited by saying, *Resolved*, That for Economic Reasons Mexico Should Be Annexed to the United States, Granted the Willingness of the Mexicans, this would limit discussion. The social and political problems would not need to be considered except as there should be a bearing on the economic situation. The fact that Mexico does not want to be annexed to the United States would not

need to be considered. The debate would then be limited, but it would still be comprehensive enough to occupy considerable time for discussion.

The wording should simplify the proposition so that argument can be centered, and it should make the proposition broad enough so there is reasonable basis for argument.

The terms included in the statement should not be ambiguous. It frequently happens that terms may be used which require defining. In the proposition, The Leading Nations of the World Should Agree on a Policy of Progressive Disarmament During the Next Ten Years, "the leading nations" and "progressive disarmament" are not quite clear. These are not ambiguous terms, but defining is necessary to determine just what is meant. What nations are to be included in the list of "leading nations?" There is a difference of opinion as to just where the list should stop. Any probability of the affirmative and negative disagreeing should be met before the debate takes place. There would be apt to be a considerable divergence of opinion between the affirmative and negative as to what would be included in "progressive disarmament."

Some excellent questions contain terms that require defining, so that this necessity should not prejudice one against such a proposition. However, definitions should be agreed upon before the

final contest takes place. Often the affirmative defines terms only to find that the negative does not agree with such definitions and the debate degenerates into mere wrangling over the meaning of terms. Nothing is to be accomplished by disputing the meaning of terms after the debate once begins. There can be no debate when the affirmative regards the proposition as meaning one thing while the negative holds to an entirely different view.

In a college debate on the proposition that, The Federal Government Should Adopt the Principles of the Kansas Industrial Law, the one side held that this meant compulsory arbitration while the other maintained that it did not. Each side spent much time reading letters and in other ways trying to uphold the position taken that should have been utilized in centering argument on the issues involved. The proposition was that of the federal government adopting the principles of the Kansas Industrial Law, but the debate became largely a wrangle over whether those principles meant compulsory arbitration or not, and neither side gained anything by the wrangle. The judge did the only thing that he could consistently do under the circumstances, he ignored that part of the argument in arriving at his decision. Had there been an agreement on this part of the proposition before the debate the speakers would have



saved much time and energy that could have been directed to the application of the principles instead of being wasted in an effort to define the principles. Both sides had spent much time and effort in preparing to uphold their contentions as to compulsory arbitration. They not only wasted valuable moments during the debate, but wasted valuable hours in getting ready for the debate. They anticipated a disagreement on the interpretation.

There is nothing to be gained by waiting until the first speaker is on the floor before attempting to define terms, but there is much to lose by this delay. If the affirmative defines terms in a way that is favorable to his own side, the negative is sure to disagree, and in the disagreement the audience is bored and the judge disappointd. The audience wonders why the debaters did not at least agree on the proposition to be debated before opening the discussion.

There is not apt to be too much agreement before the final contest. The more problems that can be settled beforehand the better it is for both sides. Every agreement is a step ahead for both and enables them to center preparation on the actual issues involved. There can be no setting out for a definite goal without knowing what proposition is to be discussed, and one can not know until the terms have been defined.

Settle all that can be settled before the debate between the opponents. This gives a real foundation for genuine argument that tests the ability of the speakers. A large percentage of the political campaign speeches lose their force because opponents place different meanings on terms used. Much Congressional argument is futile because opponents do not agree on what they are actually arguing about. It is evident that schools need to teach the necessity for establishing through agreement a sane basis for disagreement. The school debate is an excellent means of accomplishing this if opponents will learn to agree on the proposition which they are to discuss.

One-sided propositions should be avoided. It often happens that one side has the distinct advantage over the other, either due to the existence of prevailing prejudice or the general status of the proposition itself. When this is true a rewording of the proposition or the placing of some limitation on it should be decided upon. The proposition should be so worded or so limited that the advantages and disadvantages of each side are nearly equal. The preparation and presentation should demand the best that the debater can give. There is no value in making the task of one side light, while the other can not hope to win a decision irrespective of the effort put forth. Each should have approximately an equal chance with

the other. The debate then becomes what it should be, a test of the debater. Effort will then count while reasoning ability receives its just reward.

## CHAPTER III

### ARGUMENT

#### KINDS, USES AND VALUE; WHAT TO AVOID

A first-class debate is not based on a single type of argument. It is rather a combination of kinds, so unified that each blends into the other.

Every evangelistic sermon preached, every plea made by an attorney, every thought influencing editorial is an argument favoring or opposing some proposition stated or understood. These arguments may or may not be in the nature of one side in a debate, nevertheless they reveal principles which must not be overlooked by one who hopes to become proficient in debating.

The editorial may touch upon one small phase of a subject, and may be largely expository; it may be inductive or deductive argument; it may be argument by illustration, analogy, or cause and effect. The writer aims to emphasize a single point; he has no intention of covering the problem in full. The debater has no such limitations placed upon him. He must organize his material to cover the proposition in full; his proposition is stated in detail and he must adjust himself to it in such a way that nothing is overlooked. The editorial may ignore certain phases and still be a good

editorial, but the debate which ignores phases of a proposition is incomplete, and without completeness it is a poor specimen of argumentation for completeness is an essential quality of a good debate.

This makes it necessary for the debater to study all kinds of argument and determine when it is best to utilize each. Variety is an excellent thing. Any speaker will hold the attention of his audience better by introducing variety than if he pursues the method of sameness, and variety in argument is as valuable in this respect as variety in expression, gestures, etc. However, variety in argument should not have as its main purpose the breaking of monotony. It should be distinctly a portion of the chain of evidence that is being woven for the purpose of sustaining or overthrowing a proposition.

Edmund Burke's speech "On Conciliation With America," often studied as a great oration, deserves as much study for its various types of argument woven into one comprehensive debate. His introduction is purely expository. He presents the historical background, calls attention to the development of the animosity between Great Britain and her American colonies. This famous speech was delivered March 22, 1775. Ten years before Burke first came into the House as a representative from Wendover, and his first speech

was made for the repeal of the Stamp Act. It is this that he referred to when he said, "When I first had the honor of a seat in this House, the affairs of that continent pressed themselves upon us as the most important and most delicate object of Parliamentary attention. My little share in this great deliberation oppressed me."

Following the introduction is a concise statement of the purpose of his speech, then he takes up the argument to show why conciliation is practical. He uses the argument of illustration to show that to take the initiative in trying to effect a conciliation with the colonies would not be adopting a new policy. He refers to "the project which has been lately laid upon your table by the noble lord in the blue ribbon," referring to a measure of Lord North, the Prime Minister, passed on February 27, 1775, agreeing to refrain from taxing any colony which would contribute its proportion to the common defense. Lord North's measure being conciliatory Burke uses it as a basis for his plea for further action of a similar nature. The action he proposes should be taken to the colonies by utilizing the principle in Lord North's measure as the vehicle.

The power of admitted matter is not overlooked by the speaker when he says, "Peace implies reconciliation; and when there has been a material dispute, reconciliation does in a manner

always imply concession on the one part or the other." The truth he set forth in those words could not be disputed, any opponent of his proposition would at least admit the truth of that statement and with that position clear the speaker was ready to take the step of maintaining that Great Britain should take the initiative in effecting the reconciliation that all desired.

Burke then proceeds to turn again to the expository type of argument, his object in this instance being to show the value of the colonies to Great Britain from an economic point of view. This portion of his discussion leads up to his emphasis that America is worth retaining, and he makes much of the common attitude of the time that America was worth fighting for. What America was really worth he attempted to show that he might forestall any argument to the effect that he did not appreciate the worth of the land under consideration. He made excellent use of exposition to show that he did appreciate the value of America to the mother country and that he was most zealous in his desire to preserve the colonies.

At this point he introduces refutation. He has cleared the ground by his exposition, which should be the purpose of exposition in a debate. He has cleared the ground of any doubt as to the advisability of holding the American colonies, then presents the problem of how they may be held. Since

an army has been sent by Great Britain to America, only two methods remain open, fighting or conciliation. Which is preferable? Clearly the attitude of the mother country was that of the belligerent who had determined to fight. Burke was sensible to the fact that America felt this to be true, he realized that at least a large percentage of those who heard him believed that fighting was inevitable, he knew that many favored warfare. With such a state of mind the audience needed to be shown the impracticability of fighting. Burke needed to overthrow the fighting spirit. The argument was in the minds of many in his audience that to fight would be preferable to attempting to reconcile the colonies to the mother country. It was not expedient for him to merely stress the advantages of conciliation. It would have been folly to have attempted to proceed with his discussion and be assured of a fair hearing unless he refuted the argument that was in the minds of his hearers even though not expressed in formal debate. He met the situation in a masterful way.

Burke asserts that force is not "an odious, but a feeble instrument." He says, "Permit me to observe that the use of force alone is but temporary. It may subdue for a moment, but it does not remove the necessity of subduing again; and a nation is not to be governed which is perpetually to be conquered."



"My next objection is its uncertainty. Terror is not always the effect of force, and an armament is not a victory. If you do not succeed you are without resource; for, conciliation failing, force remains; but, force failing, no further hope of reconciliation is left. Power and authority are sometimes bought by kindness; but they can never be begged as alms by an impoverished and defeated violence.

"A further objection to force is, that you impair the object by your very endeavors to preserve it. The thing you fought for is not the thing which you recover; but depreciated, sunk, wasted, and consumed in the contest."

Burke has frequent occasion to resort to exposition. No attempt will be made to analyze his speech completely, that may be done by the student with careful study. However, two other features of his speech are more than worthy of consideration at this time; the one is his argument by analogy that in refusing to take the petitions of the colonies kindly the government of Great Britain is departing from principles formerly upheld; the other is his argument by authority to prove that the colonies, if left to themselves, would be liberal in raising money by taxation for the benefit of the mother country.

Burke uses specific cases, some showing the extension of privilege and Constitutional Rights to

other peoples, and one case of a petition sent to Parliament by the people of Chester. This petition is given in detail, that the hearers might judge for themselves whether it was couched in more modest language than that of petitions from America. Burke wisely does not state that this is the purpose of giving the exact wording of the petition in full; he trusts to the intelligence of his audience to know that such is his purpose. The speaker reveals what action Parliament took in regard to the petition, which was favorable. After showing what the spirit of Parliament had been in the past, Burke asks, "Now if the doctrines of policy contained in these preambles, and the force of these examples in the Acts of Parliaments avail anything, what can be said against applying them with regard to America?"

Burke's argument by use of authority followed the mention of the fifth resolution which he proposed Parliament should pass. This resolution was, "That the said General Assemblies, General Courts, or other bodies legally qualified as aforesaid, have at sundry times freely granted several large subsidies and public aids for His Majesty's service, according to their abilities, when required thereto by letter from one of His Majesty's principal Secretaries of State, and that their right to grant the same, and their cheerful-

ness and sufficiency in the said grants, have been at sundry times acknowledged by Parliament."

Burke maintains that there is sufficient reason to believe that the colonies would, in the future, willingly raise such funds as needed. He shows what they have done in the past. He does not depend on reports or even on acknowledged facts that cannot be substantiated by authentic records. He calls attention to the records made in the journals of Parliament concerning the liberality of the American colonies in raising funds. This is an authority that can not be questioned. The full text of this argument by authority is given in Chapter VI, Model Arguments.

Argument by authority strengthens the position of the speaker by introducing matter that can not be disregarded. Authoritative statements carry weight. Burke's audience was compelled to recognize the fact that the colonies had been liberal in raising funds to promote the public welfare, because the journals of Parliament contained records that were not to be disputed. The exact volumes and dates of the journals were mentioned by the speaker.

Argument by authority is valuable when a close connection is shown between the authoritative statement and the issue at hand, and when the authority is such that there can be no question of authenticity or reliability. Such argument should

be used sparingly, but no debater should hesitate to make use of authority whenever it seems that a position taken may be strengthened by it. By saying that argument by authority should be used sparingly, this does not imply a close interpretation of the meaning of the term used. It sometimes happens that a citation of several authorities is advisable, but the debater should not make the mistake of citing so many authorities that he leaves little room for his own deductions and conclusions. It is his own proposition rather than the statement of an authority that the speaker wants to keep before his audience. The debate is judged on the use that the speaker makes of authority cited rather than the citation itself. The authority cited by Burke was not to be questioned, and the particular citation was forceful, but only as he made the application to the issue involved did he strengthen his position. The debater needs to keep in mind that his reasoning power, and his ability to apply and co-ordinate, is of first importance.

Very often speakers spend much time in quoting the opinions of others on a subject; for example, one may quote labor leaders and industrial experts on the matter of the minimum wage. What many have said on this subject they seem to think will be accepted as proof in defense of or in opposition to a certain position that is taken. Such

wholesale citation of views from real authorities or those who have less reason to speak is not debating. No doubt the opponent could quote as many authorities who hold directly opposite views. This abuse of authority is responsible for numerous adverse decisions of critical debate judges. Use authority, not in place of argument, but to strengthen argument.

### Analogy

In Hayne's rejoinder to Webster's reply to an earlier speech by Hayne, he presents the analogy of the federal constitution in its binding together of the States being like a contract between individuals. His argument is that Webster would maintain the constitution as a binding contract with only one party to the contract having the right of interpretation.

If Hayne had definitely shown that the constitution was the same as a contract between individuals with only one party having the right of interpretation as to the meaning of the contract, then his argument by analogy would have been strikingly effective. Webster, however, made this part of Hayne's speech appear weak by showing "the absurdity of making the thing created, that is, the government, a party to the compact that created it," as Charles H. Sylvester says in his *English and American Literature*, Vol. 111, pages 132-3.

Argument by analogy should be subjected to severe tests before the debater presents it in support of his proposition. It may be argued that the United States should own the railroads of the country because government-owned roads in other countries have proven satisfactory. The opponent would not accept this as a fact. He would attempt to show that the government-owned roads in other countries have not given satisfaction, but assuming that there should be no possibility of disputing the claim to satisfaction in foreign countries, yet the analogy would not be sound argument. There are numerous differences that must be taken into consideration. If the conditions were the same in this country as those that prevail in other countries, and assuming that government-owned roads were satisfactory in foreign lands, then it would be strong argument to assert that because of this satisfaction elsewhere, government-owned roads would in all probability prove satisfactory in the United States.

Argument by analogy draws conclusions regarding a particular case by reference to another particular case, but the speaker needs to be quite certain that the differences involved are not such that the conclusion is unfounded. Burke's argument by analogy regarding the redress of grievances was strong, not because of a sameness in grievances, but because similar principles were

involved. He was arguing for a principle. The purpose decides the practicability of a line of argument. The principle of compulsory military training might be upheld by reference to what is done in other countries, but to attempt to prove that the United States should adopt compulsory military training because such a system has given satisfaction and been found to be practical in Switzerland is to ignore the differences between the two countries that must be taken into consideration.

An industrial city of seventy-five thousand has adopted the Commission Form of Government and has found the plan practical. High school students in another industrial city of about the same size, and where conditions are very similar, are debating the proposition that the Commission Form of Government should be adopted by their city. The affirmative refers to the other city, maintaining that the success of the plan in that city makes it seem reasonable to conclude that it would be successful in their own city. This is sound argument since the two cities have much the same problems to solve and are dealing with very similar conditions. If one city should be largely residential while the other is industrial, or if other conditions were distinctly different, it would not help the affirmative to use the one particular case in support of the other.

### **Inductive Argument**

Inductive argument is the arriving at a general law by the observing of particulars. Aristotle contributed much to inductive and deductive thinking while others have built upon his contribution until the modern thinker is given most valuable principles to govern his reasoning process.

About a half century ago the inventor of the microphone, David Edward Hughes, found electrical impulses in space which he and others could not explain. Though he used those impulses to send signals several hundred yards, scientists thought that his results must have been due to some trick of his instruments that had misled him. Their criticism had the effect of causing him to give up further experiments. He had made the beginning toward the discovery of a general law, but because he failed to follow up his advantage, the determining of that general law was left to another while the world was deprived of the wireless longer than it should have been. Hughes observed a particular, but did not follow it up to establish a general law.

The invention of the steam engine resulted from the observance of a particular case and following it up to establish a general law. Astronomers established the general law of the move-



ments of planets by the observance of particular cases.

The debater is sometimes confronted with the necessity for the establishing of a general law. For example, should the debate be on the proposition that the closed shop promotes the general welfare of society, the affirmative has the task of establishing the general law that the closed shop is best for society. One may cite a particular city in which the closed shop is universal and show that in this place it has been highly beneficial to society, taking up the various details of the influence of the closed shop on society as a whole within the borders of the municipality. This, however, does not establish the general law that the closed shop is best for society any more than the general law of sound waves was established by the findings of David Edward Hughes. The debater must go into the subject deeper than this. He must observe the closed shop in various places and under varying conditions. If with such observance he is able to show satisfactory results, irrespective of place or conditions, he is then ready to claim that beyond any reasonable doubt the general law has been established that the closed shop is best for society.

The debater needs to weigh his evidence carefully while proceeding from a particular case to a general law. He is apt to come to his final con-

clusions too quickly. Before the law can be safely established, the particular cases observed must be shown to be representative of the whole. One needs to be reasonably certain that there are no exceptions to the law. Germany tried to establish in the minds of her people during the world war the general principle that America would not fight, basing her argument on the fact that we did not fight irrespective of what they had done up to the close of the year 1916. The fallacy of holding to that principle was demonstrated when the exceptional instance or case appeared and we did fight. The debater must diligently search for the exceptions, and when he finds them he may be able to show that the conditions in the particular instance are so unusual that the exception does not destroy the general law.

### **Deductive Argument**

Deductive argument, or drawing conclusions regarding a particular case through the application of a general law, is a directly opposite process from inductive argument.

The general law has long been established that by the force of gravity anything heavier than air must fall to the ground. With this law as a basis for argument, people long contended that any kind of aircraft would be an impossibility except of the balloon type, which was sustained by means of a bag filled with gas lighter than air.

Others would not be persuaded that it was impossible to invent something which could travel in the air despite the law of gravity, and so the experiments continued in an effort to offset the force which was everywhere recognized. While the masses cried impossible the few continued their experiments and gave the world the aeroplane. They did not overcome the law of gravity, nor did they find an exception to it, but they demonstrated that the thing could be done in spite of the law that was established.

The general laws concerning human affairs are not so inflexible as the law of gravity or other natural laws. The generalizations which are commonly accepted may have exceptions. It is not necessary to overcome the law to establish an exception. Only natural laws can be said to be inflexible. To navigate the air men had to create a force that would counteract the influence of the force of gravity, but in the conduct of human affairs the exception to the rule may be as natural as the fact that most cases fall within the prescribed limits of the rule.

The debater is not justified in holding that the general law is proof concerning the particular case without showing that there is nothing about the particular case that would likely make it an exception to the general law. He needs to show that there is nothing unusual or exceptional about

this case, that it is very similar to other cases which time has demonstrated come within the law. In arguing in favor of the closed shop in the steel industry, the speaker may show that the policy has been adopted in other industries with such success that a general rule has been established of the closed shop being a good thing. Presume that he could show this to be true, yet he would need to show that the similarity of the steel industry to other industries was striking while the differences were negligible in so far as these would influence the working of the closed shop policy.

Absolute proof can not be established by either inductive or deductive argument, but it may be shown that proof has been established beyond reasonable doubt. Induction and deduction are "forms of inference" proceeding from the known, or what is assumed to be known, to the unknown. This form of argument infers that proof has been established. To establish probable proof the debater needs to be certain that his process of reasoning is not faulty. A study of logic in this connection helps to correct any tendencies toward faulty reasoning. Inference requires the accepting of some established fact; it requires the acceptance of a known statement or premise associated with some other accepted statement, while the reasoning process draws a conclusion from the premises, establishing thereby a new known fact. How-

ever, the debater needs to show that his conclusion is justified by the premises, and that the premises are true.

The following argument may be used to illustrate:

All irrigation projects are successful.

The Columbia Basin land reclaiming plan is an irrigation project.

These are the premises on which a conclusion is to be based, and the conclusion naturally follows that the Columbia Basin land reclaiming plan would be successful. There is nothing wrong with this argument; the reasoning is not faulty, assuming that the premises are true, but are the premises true? The general law has been established that irrigation projects are successful, but are there no exceptions? Is it true that all irrigation projects are successful? If not, then the original premise is false, and what can we say of the conclusion, must it be also false? The conclusion in this case might be true and it might be false, for some irrigation projects are successful; and if some are successful and the Columbia Basin land reclaiming plan is an irrigation project, then it might be successful. It is not sound reasoning to substitute the word "some" for the word "all" in the original premise and then assume that the conclusion is true. This would make both premises true, but there would be lacking the general

law on which to base the conclusion concerning the particular case. The general law must be established or known to exist before the inference can be drawn concerning the particular case. If the conclusion is justified by the premises, and if the premises are true, then the conclusion is true; if either premise is false there is no basis for a conclusion, while the reasoning is faulty when the premises do not justify the conclusion.

### **Cause and Effect**

The argument of cause and effect, either arguing from cause to effect or from effect to cause, is quite common. We are almost daily confronted with problems which involve the principles of cause and effect, we feel that it is necessary to our welfare to know what has caused a certain effect.

In debating one needs to be cautious in claiming that some effect has been due to a definite cause. In arguing against the maintaining of the present tariff schedules it may be claimed that the schedules are responsible for unwarranted high prices. It may be asserted that the tariff on sugar is responsible for an advance in price, which, if it could be proven, would be an effective argument against the duty as it exists. But is the tariff responsible for a price that is higher than the general public and so-called expert economists think should exist? Are no other factors involved aside

5

from the tariff that would tend to influence the price? He who takes the effect and attempts to locate the cause must take these matters into consideration.

Many political speeches, especially of the type that is in opposition to the party in power, are filled with faulty reasoning concerning cause and effect. The administration is blamed by political opponents for nearly everything that has gone wrong within the nation. Much of this cause and effect agitation is ridiculous in the extreme. Some of the better class newspapers and magazines are prone to fall into error in this respect in their editorials, showing the necessity of weighing all evidence carefully and rejecting that which will not stand the test of closest scrutiny.

No evidence that will not stand every test for validity is worth retaining. The debater who argues from cause to effect or from effect to cause must be certain that there is a casual relationship. Unless one thing could be reasonably caused by another, the argument is not sound. Cause and effect argument is very effective if valid, but if not it is useless. Its value depends upon the reasonableness of the deductions. It is not necessary to prove positively that a certain thing was caused by another if it can be shown that in all probability a stated cause led to a given effect. Sometimes it is known that a specific cause did lead to a cer-

tain effect. When this is true we have the case of a fact being established. Generally the relation is only sufficiently close to establish a strong probability which serves the purpose of the debater.

### **Rebuttal**

Rebuttal argument is the test of the debater's ability to analyze his opponent's position and strengthen his own case by showing wherein his own position is superior to that of the opponent. As has been stated, refutation should come in the constructive speeches whenever one believes such argument will clear away prejudice or in any other way strengthen one's case. The rebuttal speech following the constructive speeches has the double purpose of showing weaknesses in the opponent's argument and emphasizing special points which the speaker wishes most to impress upon the mind of his audience.

Naturally a rebuttal speech cannot be prepared beforehand as one might a constructive speech, but its preparation should not be left to the inspiration of the moment after the debate opens. A thorough knowledge of the subject, which means studying both sides, prepares one for whatever the opponent may say and is all the preparation necessary previous to the time of the actual contest. Many debaters waste their time in trying to cover too much ground in their rebuttals.



It is better to emphasize two or three points than to scatter effort over a half dozen or more and not emphasize any.

A good salesman "comes back at" a prospect with some of his strongest selling argument whenever the prospect shows a disposition to refuse to give an order. Why does he not use his strongest points in the first place? He saves them for clinching arguments when they produce the greatest impression. To mention them in his original talk would not have as strong an effect as to present them at the close and make them emphasize some phase of the subject that has already been given considerable attention.

The good debater adopts the salesman's tactics and saves some of his ammunition for the rebuttal speech. It is not permissible to introduce new matter, but it is expedient to emphasize points previously made by presenting additional argument bearing directly on the issue. It sometimes happens that one is able to turn tables on his opponent, that is, accept his argument as true and then show that instead of supporting his own side of the proposition that it has the opposite effect. This is forceful rebuttal.

Tell what you have to say and then stop, is a good rule to follow at all times. Trying to fill in the time when what you have to say can be said in less is to weaken argument. Covering the ground

consistently rather than taking up a certain amount of time is the important thing.

### **Counter Proposals**

Very often the negative presents a counter proposal. This places a heavier burden on themselves, but when it can be shown that the counter proposal is preferable to the one that the affirmative maintains it places the affirmative in an unfavorable position. An effective means of showing that a proposition should not be sustained is to show that there is a better means of meeting the situation. The employer-employee council can be offered as a counter proposal in a debate in which the affirmative upholds the closed shop.

The negative should not adopt this plan unless an exceptionally worthy counter proposal can be made. The affirmative should be prepared to meet any such proposal that may be presented. The question should be studied to discover any possible proposals that the negative may put forth to determine whether these are strong or weak and to be ready to answer such argument. For the affirmative to be surprised is to acknowledge a lack of preparation.

### **Humor**

Humor in debate may be either valuable or detrimental. If it serves to strengthen a point or to turn the tables on the opponent, it is effective; if it merely introduces variety in the debate or in any

way distracts from the issue under discussion, it has a detrimental influence.

A lawyer was once called upon to defend a man who had assaulted a saloon keeper. The man had gone into the saloon, drank some liquor, and under its influence had quarreled with the proprietor and beaten him with a bottle. The attorney urged that the Court take into consideration the fact that his client was under the influence of the liquor he had drunk before the offense was committed. The Court was not inclined to look at the incident so lightly, emphasizing the aggravated character of the crime. The judge said: "Your client admits he assaulted this man with a bottle," whereupon the lawyer replied, "Yes, Your Honor, we admit all that, but I beg you to remember that this man first assaulted my client with its contents." This unexpected turn of affairs made even the judge smile and the accused was given a light sentence.

Lincoln had a masterful way of using humor to turn tables on his opponents and to emphasize points which he was trying to make. It was natural with him. Few people have the ability to make use of it in argument, and when they attempt to do so weaken their own position rather than strengthening it. It is possible to acquire the ability, though this is seldom accomplished. The debater should recognize his own limitations and not

attempt to pattern after others. He who would be forceful in debate must be himself, striving to make the best possible use of the abilities which he may possess.

### **What to Avoid**

Some of the things to be avoided in debate have already been mentioned in this chapter. The fallacies in argument, generalization, jumping at conclusions, etc., have been touched upon. Other common errors are those of arguing beside the point, arguing in a circle, and holding that certain statements must be accepted as admitted matter when the facts do not warrant the assumption.

A lawyer once told his son who had just been admitted to the bar that whenever he had a case when justice seemed to conflict with the law, to argue for justice; when the law was on his side, to argue in defense of the law, and when neither was on his side, to talk around the point.

Arguing in a circle or talking around the point is an error frequently encountered in debate. It is like defining a word and using the word itself in the definition. The debater needs to ask himself whether he has made progress toward emphasizing a point under discussion, or if he has come back to the place where he had started.

Arguing beside the point and arguing in a circle are the results of not definitely marking out the way that is to be taken and holding strictly to

the highway. Driving straight to a point, having one's goal definitely established and the way marked out by which it may be reached prevents the error of arguing without accomplishing anything.

Admitted matter may or may not be agreed upon by the opposing sides. Previous agreement clears the ground for both sides. If there is no agreement previously, the one who presents matter which he holds must be admitted by all needs to be sure that his stand can not be reasonably questioned. Burke did not ask his opponents to agree with him that "peace implies reconciliation." He knew that no one could reasonably disagree with him, for peace would be an impossibility until the factions were so reconciled to each other that they would desist from fighting. Burke was sure of his position. The debater needs to be sure that he is right before he presents material as being admitted. If his stand can be questioned by the opponent, he loses much; if it cannot be questioned, he gains prestige with his audience by building up a stronger case for himself.

The question under discussion must determine the method of procedure, the kinds of argument to use, when to use, what to emphasize. Chapters VI and VII contain model arguments which should be studied in connection with the foregoing presentation of the subject.

# **PART TWO**



## **Preparation and Presentation**



## CHAPTER IV

# PREPARATION AND PRESENTATION

One's presentation of a subject will depend largely on his preparation. On his preparation depends whether he presents the topic in a well-organized manner or whether he goes at the task in a hit-and-miss fashion, missing more often than hitting an issue squarely. Change the wires on the spark plug of a gasoline motor and what happens? The firing is done at the wrong time to get the benefit of the charge of gasoline. The debater who does not organize his material is in the same position as a motor improperly wired. He is sure to expend his force at the wrong time to get the full benefit of what he may have to say.

One needs to know his subject thoroughly, which requires extensive study, and he must determine the issue from the material at hand, which requires careful analysis. He must likewise organize the subject matter so that he may proceed with everything arranged in logical sequence. This does not mean that there is only one logical order by which material may be arranged for a discussion of a subject. There may be various methods of procedure, as there are different roads



by which one may get from a given place to another, but it is necessary to determine how one is going to proceed, and be certain that each step of process leads to some definite conclusion. There is no excuse for a detour; the obstructions need to be cleared away before meeting an opponent in formal debate, that is, the obstructions that prevent one presenting a logical discussion of the topic.

The proposition needs to be analyzed, and the collecting of material bearing on the subject is necessary before one is in a position to make an analysis. The introductory analysis includes the determining of issues. This should be followed by outlining the proposition or preparing the brief. The main points are determined by the issues. Sub-points coming under each may then be placed in logical order and these developed systematically. A brief, covering the subject extensively, is essential to the final step of getting a speech into shape. The brief serves the purpose of getting subject matter arranged in logical order.

Whether the speech should be written out in full is something that must be determined by personal opinion. Some debaters are successful who follow this method; others are just as successful who make no attempt to prepare their speeches completely. The discussion written out in full, especially if memorized, makes the debate me-

chanical. The speaker is free to adjust himself to conditions as they arise if he has a well-organized brief, knows what he intends to present, and has his subject so well in hand that he can follow his plan unhesitatingly. Memorizing a speech is really a handicap, since it deprives one of the power of thoughts that are certain to strike the speaker after he gets on the floor. Writing the speech out in full has only doubtful value and is not necessary if one knows his subject.

What use should one make of the brief? is a question often asked. Should the speaker have a copy of his brief in his hands while on the floor? Again this is a matter to be determined by personal opinion, nevertheless the fact remains that the less one depends on mechanical helps the better impression he makes on his audience. "He didn't have it in him," is a slang expression often heard in reference to a speaker. The expression may be inelegant, nevertheless it is forceful. The speaker should have so mastered his subject that he has "it in him" ready to deliver to his audience. Use only such mechanical helps as are necessary to give a clear presentation of the subject, remembering that all such helps count against the speaker rather than for him. Small cards of post card size or smaller are frequently used on which the main headings can be written. These cards can be arranged properly so that one part of the discussion

follows another consistently. The cards may be held in one hand without attracting more than passing attention. They serve as a safeguard. The speaker may not need to refer to his notes; if not, so much the better. If he does, a hasty glance at a card should be all that is necessary and he may continue his speech uninterrupted.

Citing authorities should be done in such a way that the citation does not cause a break. Some speakers commit a quotation to memory; others bring book, magazine, letter, or other evidence, to the stage with them and read what the authority says on the subject. The latter method is most effective if the speaker can do this without becoming confused or hesitating. He needs to have his material readily accessible so that the attention of the audience has no opportunity to waver for an instant. Getting the attention of the audience right at the start and holding the attention until the conclusion of the speech is very important.

In preparing for a debate everything that has any bearing on the subject is grist to be ground in the mill, but one is not ready for the grinding until he can get the material organized and determine the relative value of each item. Not everything can be ground into flour; much of it must remain as a by-product which the debater retains for his own benefit but which he cannot use in the debate.

The material comes as a conglomerate mass, without order, without a relationship between units. One does not know what he is going to find when he begins his search for material; he must take whatever comes, later getting some semblance of order from the maze before him. The best way of learning how to do is by doing. This chapter takes up a specific question, for that reason, and follows the debater through the various processes.

It is decided to discuss Philippine Independence, and first of all a wording of the proposition must be agreed upon. After much deliberation something like this results: *Resolved*, That the United States Should Immediately Grant Complete Independence to the Philippine Islands. This is a clear statement, the only possible chance for a disagreement on the interpretation of terms being on the term "complete independence." Since there is a possibility of disagreement, the term needs defining. Does it mean that the United States will give the islands their freedom while retaining the right to interfere in their affairs if it should be deemed essential to the welfare of the people? No, it could not mean that. Could it be interpreted as leaving an opportunity for Japan and the United States to enter into an agreement guaranteeing the independence of the islands? Such an interpretation would not be without reason, but it brings into discussion some phases of the

subject which the debaters prefer having left out, and so it is agreed that by "complete independence" is meant that the islands shall be given freedom from any paternal care on the part of America, that they shall become a separate nation among the nations of the world, without shackles of any kind and without any right to demand protection from the United States; they shall be turned loose on the sea of world activity and allowed to take care of themselves as best they can, the United States ceasing to exercise any authority whatsoever and no longer having any responsibility.

Having arrived at a decision as to the interpretation of the term the debater knows how to proceed, he knows what material is applicable and what is not.

One who searches for material with the idea that he knows what he wants, unless he is already quite familiar with the subject, is not going at the task with an open mind. Let him take what comes.

Suppose that we consult *The Reader's Guide of magazine literature* to find material on our subject. We note the reference, Russell, Charles Edward. *The Philippines: Independent or Vassal? Nation*, Vol. 114: 487, April 26, 1922. Finding the issue of *The Nation* magazine for April 26, 1922, we locate the article on page 487. We read the article and some of it we find particularly

striking, such as "The assertion that only politicians desire independence is perilous stuff to be circulating in this country. It is untrue and viciously misleading. These people have a background of 350 years of struggle for liberty. They have their historic heroes of that struggle dear to them as Winkelried to the Swiss and Emmet to the Irish. They have their records of brave deeds, wonderful sacrifices, daring revolutions. American history, taught in their schools for twenty-two years, has fortified and deepened the lessons of their own. They have set their hearts upon freedom and nationality. They will never be satisfied with anything else. We may, if we please, shoot them into submission. We cannot kill their aspirations. For all our guns and all our troops they will be henceforth our most reluctant subjects.

"Even the Wood-Forbes mission, unfriendly to independence, recorded the evidences it found everywhere, except in the Moro country, of this seated conviction. It was evidence not needed. Since 1916 the government has been in the hands chiefly of a Legislature elected by the people. At every session it has demanded independence and appropriated the people's money to get it. At each succeeding election the legislators who have done most for independence have won the largest popular votes. No opposition has appeared any-

where to separation; the only criticism of the party in power has been for not doing enough for it."

There is something in this quotation that sets us thinking in a different channel. "The Wood-Forbes mission, unfriendly to independence." We are all somewhat familiar with the fact that General Leonard Wood and W. Cameron Forbes, former Governor General of the Philippines, made a careful survey of the Philippines with a view to determining whether or not the people were ready for independence. We have a rather hazy knowledge of what was done, but our knowledge is not sufficient to serve us on this occasion. We need more accurate information. Is it possible that these men were prejudiced against independence before they made their investigation and that their prejudice influenced their recommendations, or did the author of the quoted article merely refer to the fact that they made an unfriendly recommendation? We must search farther before satisfying ourselves in this respect.

In the January, 1922, issue of the Current History Magazine, pages 678-94, we find the text of the Report of the Philippine Commission. The mission arrived in Manila on May 4, 1921, and the report was signed October 8, 1921, some five months later. Instantly we ask ourselves whether this was sufficient time to thoroughly investigate the conditions throughout the numerous islands so

that the mission might be able to pass accurate judgment. The report takes up the historical background, going back to a time before the discovery of the islands by Europeans, the results of American occupation and how those results were accomplished are given briefly, information concerning the Philippine people is given, present conditions are discussed. The report takes up in detail the Constabulary and Public Order, Administration of Justice, Public Education, the Bureau of Science, Health and Sanitation, Economic Conditions, Finances, Public Works, Government in Business, Elections, Legislation, General Conclusions and Recommendations. The report indicates that the Commission had gone into the matter thoroughly.

From this report we learn that "Suffrage is still confined to men and to those who can read and write, who hold a certain amount of property or pay a certain tax, or to those who held offices under the Spanish regime."

Concerning legislation, the report asserts that as the Filipinos have been given more legislative authority, the legislation has suffered. In the General Conclusions we read, "We find that a reasonable proportion of officials and employes are men of good character and ability and reasonably faithful to the trust imposed upon them, but that the efficiency of the public service has fallen off



and that they are now relatively inefficient, due to lack of inspection and to the too rapid transfer of control to officials who have not had the necessary time for proper training.

"We find there is a disquieting lack of confidence in the administration of justice, to the extent which constitutes a menace to the stability of the government.

"We feel that the lack of success in certain departments should not be considered as proof of essential incapacity on the part of the Filipinos, but rather as indicating lack of experience," etc.

The first of the Recommendations reads, "We recommend that the present general status of the Philippine Islands continue until the people have had time to absorb and thoroughly master the powers already in their hands."

Continuing our search for material we read an article in the April 13, 1921, issue of *The Outlook*, "Are the Filipinos Prepared for Independence?" by Florence C. Miller, who spent nine years in the Philippines. This article holds out that independence should be ultimately given, but maintains that the people are not yet ready for this important step.

In one article we read of the danger of Moro domination should independence be granted; elsewhere we learn that of the more than ten million

people, only about four hundred thousand belong to the Moro class.

Charles H. Sherrill, in an article on "A Philippine Republic," published in Scribner's magazine in 1920, Vol. 67, pages 480-88, favors a plan of settling the Philippine question by the adjustment of Japan's expansion program and a guarantee of independence for the Philippines being agreed to by the United States, Japan and Australia. This plan, however, involves a principle that was discarded in the interpretation of the term "complete independence" so that part of Sherrill's article can have no bearing on the debate. Nevertheless there is much other material that helps to give one a better understanding of the subject.

The Japanese menace, so-called, is taken up in numerous articles, being discussed sometimes in an anti-Japanese attitude and sometimes in a pro-Japanese manner.

We read that a recent statute of our government has ordered all official documents in the Philippines in the future to be written in English, and that this decision of our government has caused a vigorous protest from inhabitants of the islands.

Gregorio Nieva, editor of the Philippine Review, in a long article on "The Philippine Situation," published in the February 21, 1920, issue

of The Saturday Evening Post, upholds the immediate independence idea and furnishes much evidence in support of his contention.

We learn that the Philippine Legislature each year appropriates money for the express purpose of using it to continue the agitation for independence, that independence commissions have visited this country, that such a commission came in 1919 and expected to carry back to their country the good news that the islands would soon be free, but that they had to go home disappointed.

Our investigation causes us to consider what political party platforms have had to say on the subject of Philippine independence. The stand which the Democratic party took in 1912 is especially significant since that party was successful in the elections held that year. Their platform was strongly in favor of independence, holding out a promise of independence to the islands. Why did not the party carry out the promise during the eight years that it was in power? We read criticisms to the effect that when the Democrats were confronted with the actual problem of dealing with the Philippines they followed the same policies as the Republicans. Theodore Roosevelt maintained that it was an unwise thing to promise independence, but since it had been promised, that independence should be given.

In 1916 Congress passed what is known as the Jones Act, which was the first step toward carrying out the Democrat platform pledge. The preamble to this act reads:

"WHEREAS, It was never the intention of the people of the United States, in the incipency of the war with Spain, to make it a war of conquest or for territorial aggrandizement; and

"WHEREAS, It is, as it has always been, the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein; and

"WHEREAS, For the speedy accomplishment of such purpose, it is desirable to place in the hands of the people of the Philippines as large a control of their domestic affairs as can be given them without, in the meantime, impairing the exercise of the rights of sovereignty by the people of the United States, in order that, by the use and exercise of popular franchise and governmental powers, they may be the better prepared to fully assume the responsibilities and enjoy all the privileges of complete independence;

"Therefore be it enacted."

The act then sets forth the rights and privileges that shall be enjoyed by the Filipinos, it gives them the privilege of electing a legislative body, specifying the qualifications for voting. The leg-

islative body is given the power to pass all laws. Some of the highest officials must be Americans, including the Governor-General, appointed by the President of the United States. The Governor-General has the right to veto any legislative act taken by the Philippine Legislature, but a bill may be passed over his veto by a two-thirds vote. If he still does not approve, it must be sent to the President of the United States. All laws must be reported to the United States Congress, which has power to annul them. Opponents of independence maintain that the Filipinos now have self-government. Is such a claim justified by the provisions of the Jones Act?

One of the first results of the act was that Americans who had held offices in the Islands were displaced by natives who were very often less competent. A considerable number of Americans have settled in the Islands, and naturally these people are opposed to anything which lessens the authority of America and the Americans. They are, as they have always been, opposed to independence. Does race prejudice have an influence on this opposition? we ask ourselves as we attempt to analyze the situation. Should the demands of the natives or the demands of the American settlers have first consideration?

In "The Outlook for the Philippines," by Charles Edward Russell, we read: "The work of

the Legislature speaks for itself. In the five years of its existence, 1916 to 1921, it seems to have passed many wise and no conspicuously foolish measures." Does this statement seem to agree with the opinion of the Wood-Forbes report written the same year? Evidently there is a difference in opinion, and with this clash of opinion how shall we be governed?

The Jones Act clearly set forth that the Filipinos should have independence as soon as a stable government could be established. The people accepted the promise with rejoicing. Manuel L. Quezon, Resident Commissioner from the Philippines, stationed at Washington at the time the act was passed by Congress, said in speaking of the act, "It marks an epoch in our national history. We are convinced that the promise of independence contained in the bill will be faithfully fulfilled, for we know that we are dealing with a nation in the true sense jealous of its honor and its good name." The people expected to soon demonstrate their ability to establish a stable government; they believed that they had established such a government when the mission came to the United States in 1919 with a plea for independence. They have not since been convinced that a stable government does not exist.

Manuel L. Quezon became President of the Philippine Senate, and has since been most active

in his agitation for his nation to be set free. Frequent references are found to his views in this respect. In the Septembr 13, 1922, issue of *The Nation* appears a plea which Quezon addressed to President Harding, which is in reality a protest against the Wood-Forbes report. In this plea the writer stresses a section of President Wilson's Message to Congress, December 2, 1920, in which the President said: "Allow me to call your attention to the fact that the people of the Philippine Islands have succeeded in maintaining a stable government since the last action of Congress in their behalf, and thus have fulfilled the condition set by Congress as precedent to a consideration of granting independence to the Islands. I respectfully submit that this condition precedent having been fulfilled, it is now our liberty and our duty to keep our promise to the people of those Islands by granting them the independence which they so honorably covet."

Quezon discusses what might be meant by stable government and quotes a definition given by President McKinley in reference to Cuba. McKinley had defined stable government as "capable of maintaining order and observing its international obligations, insuring peace and tranquillity and the security of its citizens as well as our own." Quezon holds that this is the only reasonable definition that can be given to the term.

He takes up the orderly manner in which elections are held in the Philippines, and general conditions pertaining to the government, on the whole presenting a very able plea.

The reply of President Harding is also printed in the same issue of *The Nation*, and there is in this an undercurrent that tends to show an inclination to delay independence indefinitely. The reply was intensely disappointing to the Philippine people, who felt that the President had evaded the real problems involved in the situation.

Investigation shows that not any large numbers of Japanese have gone to the Philippines during the past quarter of a century, and of those only a few thousand have remained. The climate is not favorable to them. Would this have a bearing on the possibility of Japanese domination? The Japanese have other problems. Korea is being held against the will of the people. The Philippine Islands could not be taken over by any country without a tremendous contest, since the Islands are so situated and the country is such that conquering would be extremely difficult. Japan would have no easy task if she attempted to take the Philippine Islands, and in the meantime her problems in another quarter of the globe would be an opportunity for Korea to throw off the yoke that she bears so unwillingly. This would be



true, granted that Japan desired to take the Philippines and would attempt to do so. But is there sufficient reason to justify a belief that Japan really wants them? Are the opinions voiced such that we may regard them as authoritative?

What has been the attitude of the American government toward Philippine independence? Going back through the past quarter of a century of history we find that the government has again and again expressed itself as favoring ultimate independence.

Senator Albert J. Beveridge, of Indiana, on January 9, 1899, delivered a speech in the United States Senate, in which he said in part: "The Philippines are ours forever, 'territory belonging to the United States,' as the Constitution calls them. And just beyond the Philippines are China's illimitable markets. We will not retreat from either. We will not repudiate our duty in the archipelago. We will not abandon our opportunity in the Orient. We will not renounce our part in the mission of our race, trustee, under God, of the civilization of the world. And we will move forward to our work, not howling out regrets like slaves whipped to their burdens, but with gratitude for a task worthy of our strength, and thanksgiving to Almighty God that He has marked us as His chosen people, henceforth to lead in the regeneration of the world.

"This Island Empire is the last land left in all the ocean. If it should prove a mistake to abandon it, the blunder once made would be irretrievable. If it proves a mistake to hold it, the error can be corrected when we will. . . . But to hold it will be no mistake." The Senator then shows the ultimate value of the Philippines in helping America to develop commerce in the Orient. Somewhere in the material located in the search to see all sides of the proposition there is a reference to nations with one eye turned to heaven and the other scanning the balance sheet. Could it be that the writer had reference to such utterances as that of Senator Beveridge, and if so, do such utterances represent the intention of our government rather than the statement often repeated that the Philippines are being held only temporarily?

Cuba was freed when our government could have retained the island if there had been any inclination to do so. That is a fact that has weight in determining the sincerity of our government.

In the January 17, 1923, issue of *The Nation* an account is given of a resolution passed by the Philippine Legislature, asking for permission to call a constitutional convention and draft a constitution which would form the basis for the government after independence is eventually secured.

Everywhere we find evidences of the United States occupation being beneficial to the Filipinos. The Filipinos appreciate what the United States government has done for them and acknowledge that conditions in the Islands are better than they have ever been in all the centuries of existence. Uncle Sam has been to the Filipinos a real friend as they are free to state.

The foregoing presents in brief form some of the material which one finds in searching for information on the subject. It is in disorganized form, and in that form it is found. One must take it as it comes and later co-ordinate.

We will assume that the debater has had an open mind in his search. The material as presented so far in this chapter would tend to leave one with an open mind. There is much that might be said on either side of the question which makes it an excellent proposition for debate. No matter which side the debater is going to take up, he must get at the bottom of his subject, he must analyze and build up the subject step by step.

Suppose that the debater is to represent the affirmative, he must still look at the proposition with an open mind so that he may be able to discover the strong points of his opponent. He is ready to begin his analysis.

Where shall he begin? Looking over the material at random, one makes the approach from

the standpoint of what is best for the Filipinos. Would the people gain anything through independence? Does this seem to be one of the issues? Giving careful thought to the matter it is evident that the problem can never be settled by reference to that which is concerned with an improvement of situation. All peoples all over the world want to be free from the domination of any other people. Independence is a desire as instinctive with nations as with individuals. No individual is content to be under the domination of another individual when there is a possibility of being free. No nation is ever content to be the vassal of another when there is the slightest chance of being independent. Freedom, independence, these things are valued above most everything else. The Philippine problem can never be settled by holding out that the people would be better off while subject to the United States than while maintaining their separate identity no more than America would consent to become the vassal of another power, even though it might be shown that it would be to our economic and political advantage. There is a national instinct that demands independence, a racial instinct that insists on having the privilege of self determination. This instinct is now recognized in international affairs, and in the new internationalism one of the principles is that people shall have the right of self determina-

tion. We would be willing to sacrifice much to retain our independence, and so would any other people in the world.

Whether the Filipinos would or would not gain anything by independence can not be made an issue since it is certain that they, as well as all other peoples in the world, would be willing to lose something in order that they might be free. The debater must look further before determining an issue.

Why did the United States retain the Islands after the Spanish-American war? We must examine the historical background to understand this matter. We must note the international complications. The German-Great Britain incident in connection with the surrender of the Spaniards to Dewey in May, 1898, is especially significant. Spanish, German, English and American warships were just outside of Manila on May 1, 1898. The Americans had come to attack; the Germans showed a hostile attitude to the Americans, while the British commander announced that he had come to see that there should be no interference of an outside Power, in other words, that the fight was to be between Spain and America.

With four nations having warships in the Philippine waters ready for action, it was evident that the Philippines were looked upon as a strategic point in the world. That Germany wanted

the Islands for herself there could be no doubt; that England was interested in maintaining a balance of power in the Pacific to protect her own interests was equally certain. Spain's colonial empire was crumbling, the situation would radically change soon, and it so happened that the United States secured the Islands at the critical time when international thought was concerning itself with the best solution of the Philippine question. While the Filipinos were struggling for freedom from the Spanish yoke it was known in international affairs that they could not be independent, for the people were not fitted for self-government besides greedy eyes were turned on the Islands from other parts of the world.

British statesmen were clearly in favor of the United States retaining the Philippines once they had secured possession, and held that this was a duty which America owed to the peace of the world. Some of America's statesmen took the same view and the Islands were retained temporarily, partly as a duty which the United States owed to the welfare of the world.

If America held the Islands it owed something to the people who were being denied the privilege of the independence which they so much desired. This duty was recognized and the government set itself to the task of developing a policy which would serve the best interests of the Fili-

7

pinos. As a nation upholding democracy, the United States could do nothing less than carry its democratic principles to the millions over whom it exercised authority; upholding the Declaration of Independence, it could not consistently plan to hold a people unwillingly.

America accepted its duty to the Filipinos as that of preparing them through education for self-government and establishing in the Islands such conditions as would lead to the highest development of the people. What has America done? It has established a school system which is reaching about seventy per cent of the school population; it has developed that system until it compares favorably with school systems in the United States, offering courses that include higher education. The Filipinos have become interested in education. Through its influence the people have been given a larger outlook on life, have developed social qualities as well as economic and political efficiency. The people have learned to do by doing, which applies to industrial activity, the professions, office-holding, etc. The building of good roads and the establishing of sanitary conditions were included in the program of the American government in its efforts to promote the welfare of the people. The United States had an excellent program to carry out, and its success in carrying out that program has demonstrated real efficiency.

Filipinos recognize the good work of America, while America acknowledges that the ability of the natives has been a contributing factor in the noteworthy success.

America had a definite duty to perform for the world and for the Filipinos before the Philippine Islands were made independent. Has America performed that duty? That is a vital issue. Has America performed her whole duty in respect to the Philippine Islands? Has she performed her duty in holding the Islands? This, however, is a rather broad view to take of the subject as a single issue in a debate, and it seems to divide itself into two parts: First, are the Filipinos ready for self-government? Second, would the independence of the Philippine Islands have a detrimental influence on world affairs? These are two issues which demand attention.

America has, all through the years since the Islands have been under the supervision of this country, maintained that ultimately the Philippines would be given their liberty. Cuba was freed shortly after the close of the Spanish-American war, which was evidence of the sincerity of America's promises. Why did not America give the Philippines their independence as early as Cuba? Were the cases analogous? Can the treatment given the people of Cuba be used as an argument favoring Philippine independence?



The great differences that are outstanding serve to show that the cases at least are not analogous. The people of Cuba were better developed than the Filipinos; they had the advantage of a common language or a language spoken by the larger percentage of the people; they were close to the United States, where they could be safeguarded without lessening their opportunities to develop their own initiative; the people were living close to each other, while the Filipinos are separated by long distances and are living on approximately three thousand islands. The Philippines are in a strategic position in the world while Cuba is not. There are various differences to be taken into consideration, so we cannot say that making Cuba independent is a reason for making the Philippines independent. The action regarding Cuba is only evidence of the sincerity of the United States in keeping her promises.

The United States gave her promise that she would make the Philippines free at some time. This promise was reiterated all through the years by every President. There was no definite time set, but ultimate independence was promised. The Democratic party went before the American people in 1912 on a pledge to make the Philippines free; by the vote of the people the party was placed in power. During the administration that followed the Jones Act was passed, which definite-

ly stated that the Islands should be made independent when the people had established a stable government. The Filipinos accepted this agreement and set themselves zealously to the task of establishing a government that would square with the reasonable interpretation as to what might be meant by stable government. The pledge of the United States has been given that the Philippines shall be made independent as soon as they establish a stable government. This is the demand of the American government. The administration went out of power before it had completed the transaction; a new administration assumed the governmental duties with the status of the Philippines changed by the Jones Act but still subject to the United States. Should the present administration be governed by the action taken during a preceding administration? President Harding, in his answer to the plea of Manuel L. Quezon for immediate independence, showed that he felt the obligation of former action to make the Philippine Islands independent as soon as it could be satisfactorily shown that a stable government had been established. The question is that of a stable government. The demand of the United States is that the Filipinos establish such a government, and the promise is that they shall then become independent. Have the Filipinos established such a government? Have they met the demands of the

American government for the privilege of independence? That is an issue before the debater.

There seems then to be three distinct issues: first, are the Filipinos ready for self-government; second, would the independence of the Philippine Islands have a detrimental influence on world affairs? third, have the Filipinos met the requirements for independence set by the United States government?

The affirmative is interested in knowing if the negative can consistently offer a counter proposal. A counter proposal to be effective must be sound, and unless such a proposal would be sound the affirmative would not need to give it serious attention. Careful thought reveals a possibility in the term "complete independence." The interpretation placed on that term means that the United States would not be a party to any agreement concerning Philippine independence, and it means that the United States would cease having any authority or responsibility whatsoever. Any material bearing directly on this has consequently been regarded as being aside from the subject, but is it? Is there not a possibility that the negative may use this as an opportunity for making a counter proposal? The negative may propose that the United States should grant independence but continue to assume the responsibility of keeping other countries out or to retain the right to intervene

should internal affairs warrant at any time. The negative may propose that the United States and Japan enter into an agreement guaranteeing the independence of the Islands, or that the United States, Japan and Australia become parties to such an agreement. These are possibilities which the affirmative must be prepared to meet. How may these proposals be answered? First, any stipulation limiting independence for the Philippines will be regarded by the Filipinos as not giving them what they want. The present status had just as well continue as to give them so-called independence and have the right to intervene, because of national or international affairs, retained by the United States. Such a limitation would not be independence.

Second, any agreement between nations guaranteeing the independence of another is of precarious value. Either there is no danger of violation which makes the agreement useless; or if there is such danger, the agreement promotes ill will rather than a friendly spirit and is, after all, no absolute guarantee. A small country might be in danger of some country not a party to the agreement and the agreeing parties be called upon to defend their protegee. All this provided there is danger; if there is danger, then the affirmative fails to prove the second contention concerning the possibility of Philippine independence having a

detrimental influence on world affairs; if the affirmative proves that contention it shows the uselessness of any agreement being entered into respecting independence. This counter proposal can well be handled under the second issue as analyzed.

This short analysis has taken up only the main features of the proposition. The debater needs to consider various other elements, such as the possibility of Moro domination, the extent of the use of the English language and whether this would probably be the leading language of the Islands following independence. He needs to consider whether the indications are that the Filipino race can achieve as much when left to their own initiative as when their activities are supervised by America. One who really becomes familiar with his subject must give it much time and thought.

Does there seem to be a relation between the first and third issues as given? Are the Filipinos ready for self-government? Have they established a stable government? There is a relation between the two, but as the one must be judged on general evidence as based on belief as to the future while the other concerns itself with what has actually been accomplished there is sufficient difference to prevent the uniting of the two issues in one.

The next step is that of determining what is known as the clash of opinion. Each issue must be taken up separately.

First, are the Filipinos ready for self-government? Points to be considered under this are:

Unity of the people.

The growth of a universal language.

Whether or not the people really want independence.

The probability of Moro domination.

The efficiency of the people.

Ability to defend themselves.

The influence of race prejudice.

As to the unity of the people the leaders of the independence movement maintain that they are reasonably well unified. Opponents assert that they are not since there are 43 distinct tribes with distinctly different interests. The friends of independence claim that the people's important interests are similar and that a national spirit has been developed.

English was adopted by the school system as the universal language. Affirmative contends that excellent progress has been made in the use of English. Negative contention, 87 distinct dialects are spoken in the Islands; protest has been made against the use of English exclusively in official documents; the total circulation of publications in the Islands which would help to develop

a universal language is only a little more than one-third of a million, or one publication to each thirty people.

Do the people want independence? Quezon and Russell, as well as others, assert that the demand for independence is universal. The Wood-Forbes report states that among the Christians there is a general desire for independence under the protection of the United States, while non-Christians and Americans favor American control. Harding's reply to Quezon's plea states that petitions are received from the Islands against independence.

Is there a probability of Moro domination? Affirmative contention is that such a probability does not exist, for the Moros are few in number and that they are becoming unified with the other people of the Islands. Negative contention is that since the Moros are Mohammedans they have nothing in common with the rest of the Filipinos; that they belong to a different class entirely, are a dominant people, and feared by the other inhabitants.

Are the people efficient? Affirmative contends that they have demonstrated efficiency, while the negative holds that the efficiency displayed is largely due to American supervision, that American efficiency has been mistaken for Filipino ability.

Would the people be able to defend themselves? Affirmative points to military efficiency, the inclination to defend the Islands, and the difficulties due to natural barriers that an enemy would encounter. Negative holds that the Islands would be a prey to other powers. Wood-Forbes report implies that with the withdrawal of the United States army and navy it would leave the Islands "a prey to any powerful nation coveting their rich soil and potential commercial advantages."

Is the influence of race prejudice evident? Affirmative holds that race prejudice is responsible for the opposition of the Americans in the Philippines to independence; that Americans can not appreciate the ability of the Filipino race; that the tendency of American officials to limit Filipino advancement is evidence of race prejudice. Negative holds that the Filipinos have been given every chance to develop; that they have not been retarded at any time, and that Americans have only good will for the people of the Islands.

Taking up the second issue, would the independence of the Philippines have a detrimental influence on world affairs? we have the following points to consider:

Danger of tempting some other power.

The spirit of internationalism.



The probability of revolution if independence is not forthcoming soon.

General world conditions.

Is there a real danger of tempting some other power by making the Islands independent. Affirmative contention is that the Japanese menace is more imaginary than real; that Japan does not want the Philippine Islands, and that they are not a temptation to any other power. Negative holds that the Japanese menace is real and that the Islands would be a temptation to other powers, in fact, to any power coveting the rich soil and enormous commercial possibilities.

Would the new spirit of internationalism be a defense to the Philippines? Affirmative asserts that it would, for a spirit of good will has been developing in recent years in spite of much antagonism. Negative opinion is that the international spirit is indefinite and untrustworthy.

Is there a probability of revolution in the Islands if independence is not soon granted? The affirmative holds that the growing animosity of the Filipinos and their disappointments due to the delay in granting independence is sowing the seeds of discord that will probably lead to open revolt unless the United States grants independence at an early date. The opposing claim that the desire for independence is not universal is negative evidence opposed to the probability of revolution.

Are the general world conditions such that Philippine independence would increase the world problems? The affirmative contention is that such independence would not have a bad influence on world affairs; that world conditions are favorable to independence. The negative maintains that the world conditions are not stable, and so long as a lack of stability exists it is unwise for a new nation to venture forth as an independent power.

Third, have the Filipinos met the requirements for independence set by the United States Government? We must consider the interpretation of the meaning of the term "stable government." As to this there is no clash of opinion. The contention on this issue is whether or not the government that has been established by the Filipinos for themselves, under the Jones Act, meets the specification as to stable government. Quezon and Russell maintain that the requirements have been met. The Wood-Forbes report says, "We find that the government is not reasonably free from those underlying causes which result in the destruction of government."

Before preparing brief and discussion the student needs to give close attention to the authorities. Who speaks with authority? Charles Edward Russell has much to say on the subject of Philippine independence. Who is he? He has

been in the Philippine service, has spent much time in the Islands, has done considerable original research and speaks with accurate knowledge. His book "The Outlook for the Philippines" has been given the endorsement of The Century Company imprint.

The Wood-Forbes report must be regarded as an authority. Manuel L. Quezon, president of the Philippine Senate, and head of various independence missions to the United States, has definite knowledge of conditions in his native land. His writings should be accepted without question as to their reliability, though it must be remembered that his opinions naturally show signs of pro-Philippine sentiment. He could not be other than an ardent advocate of independence. Gregorio Nieva, editor of *The Philippine Review*, is in a prominent position in his home land; he knows how his people feel about independence; he is in a position to judge accurately the real status of his people; he knows conditions as they are, but can not fail to favor the Philippine side of the case. Casual travelers can not be accepted as authorities, but anyone can who has been in the Philippines long enough to have gained information rather than mere passing impressions. President Harding, in his reply to the Quezon plea for independence, asserted that the Wood-Forbes Mission personnel "was chosen with the view to

have the appraisal made by outstanding and able men, who had been familiar with your earlier stages of self-development." Manifestly those who have seen the Philippines in the earlier days and have watched the stages of development through the decades, those who were in the Islands some years ago and again recently, are in a better position to speak authoritatively than either those who base their opinions on mere experience of the past or of the present. The changes and what these signify have much to do with determining the question as to what should be done concerning independence.

The debater is often inclined to use too many authorities without giving sufficient attention to the selection. A few authorities who cannot be questioned is preferable to many, a part of whom may not be accepted by either the opponents or the judge. An unaccepted authority weakens a debate.



## CHAPTER V

### THE BRIEF and Its DEVELOPMENT

This brief and the discussion following are based on the analysis and organization of material in the preceding chapter. The proposition for consideration is, *Resolved*, That the United States Should Immediately Grant Complete Independence to the Philippine Islands.

#### Introduction.

The historical background.

1 Status of the Islands before American occupation.

2 The Spanish-American war.

3 What should be done with the Islands.

(a) Reason for retaining them.

1 Duty to the world.

2 Duty to the Filipinos.

4 The policy of America.

(a) Educate the Filipinos.

(b) Prepare the Philippine Islands for independence.

5 Independence an ultimate aim.

(a) People gradually given more governmental authority.

**6 Periods of development under American rule. (Wood-Forbes Report.)**

**(a) Military period, August 13, 1898, to July 1, 1901. Islands under a military governor.**

**(b) Organization period, July 1, 1901, to October 16, 1907. Philippine Commission the sole legislative authority, this Commission being appointed by the President of the United States.**

**(c) Constructive period, 1907 to 1913. Filipinos given legislative authority, Lower House turned over to body of elected Filipinos, the Philippine Commission serving as the Upper House. Filipinos were used extensively in the government.**

**(d) Filipinization period from 1914. Filipinos were first given a majority in the Upper House followed by the Jones Act, which extended the authority of the people.**

**7. Agitation for independence.**

**(a) Has been continuous since long before the end of the Spanish regime.**

**(b) Immediate demand for independence after the United States took possession led to armed revolt.**

[(c)] Filipinos have felt that the United States would eventually make them free.

1 Freedom extended to Cuba strengthened their faith in America's sincerity.

[(d)] The Jones Act a basis for independence.

1 Independence Mission came to this country in 1919 with a plea for independence, feeling that they had met the demands of the American government, as set forth in the Jones Act, for the determination of the rights of enjoying independence.

2 Recommendation of President Wilson.

[(e)] Appropriations have been made annually by the Philippine Legislature to carry on independence agitation.

1 Other Missions have come to America to present their case.

[(f)] The Wood-Forbes Mission.

[(g)] Permission has been requested of Congress for a grant of authority to draft a Constitution.

I. The Filipinos are ready for self-government, since—



**A There is unity among the people.**

- 1 "Yes, we are all Filipinos, nothing but Filipinos, as you are all Americans . . . . notwithstanding your numerless Jews . . . . your Italian, Greek, Russian, Irish and other foreign admixtures."  
(Gregoria Nieva, editor of *The Philippine Review*, in "The Philippine Situation," *Saturday Evening Post*, February 21, 1920, page 40.)
- 2 The bulk of the people belong to the same race, the Malay.
- 3 The various tribes have much in common in spite of their differences.
  - (a) Supporting one Legislature, excepting the few who are listed as non-Christian.
  - (b) The school system has been nationalized.
  - (c) Commercial interests give them unity of purpose.
  - (d) Tribal ideals are giving place to national desires and a recognition of the Filipino spirit.

**B There is a growth of a universal language.**

- 1 The use of English has been gradually increasing.

- (a) Has been growing in favor as a trade language of the East.
- (b) Is the language of the Philippine schools.

C The people want independence.

- 1 The Wood-Forbes report states that some do not want independence, President Harding asserts that he has had petitions against independence, but
  - [(a) The President has not said that the petitions represent any considerable group of people, and it is known that Americans in the Islands are opposed to independence.
  - [(b) The Wood-Forbes report asserts that the non-Christians and Americans favor American control, and more than nine million of the population are listed in that report as Christian, the report stating that: "We find everywhere among Christian Filipinos the desire for independence," showing that the opposition to independence is limited.
- 2 Legislators favoring independence are re-elected.
- 3 The Legislature uses funds in agitation for independence without a rebuke from the people.

D The probability of Moro domination is slight.

1 The Moros have been feared because of their savage natures, but

(a) They are being civilized.

(b) They no longer present the grave problem that they once did.

2 They are of the same race as the other Filipinos.

3 The Moros are comparatively few in number.

(a) Not more than 4 per cent, about four hundred thousand, some estimates being less, the Wood-Forbes report giving the number as slightly more.

E The efficiency of the people indicates that they are ready for self-government, as shown by their efficiency as

1 Government officials.

2 Professional and industrial activity.

(a) The people have marked ability.

3 The people are alert, and with excellent mental capacity, making rapid advancement in school.

4 The claim that results are due to the proficiency of American supervision overlooks the fact that without the ability of the Filipinos the results could have never been achieved.

F The Filipinos are able to defend themselves

1 Have military ability.

(a) Have demonstrated their fighting qualities.

2 The Islands are difficult to conquer.

(a) Spaniards never succeeded in subduing the people during their centuries of occupation.

G Race prejudice is responsible for opposition to independence.

1 Americans in the Islands not inclined to give the people full credit for their capacity.

2 Wherever two or more races come into close contact with each other prejudice exists.

(a) Americans do not want to be governed by Filipinos, nor do they want to leave the Islands, largely because of economic advantages.

3 Chief opposition to independence comes from Americans at home or in the Philippines.

II. Independence of the Philippines would not have a detrimental influence on world affairs, because

A The danger of tempting some other power is negligible, for

- 1 The Filipinos are prepared to defend themselves.
  - 2 There is little reason to believe that Japan wants the Islands, and
    - (a) She would have difficulty in getting them if she did want them.
    - (b) Her troubles would be increased in other parts of the world if she attempted to take the Islands.
  - 3 There is no indication that any other power wants to take the Islands.
- B The world is enjoying a new spirit of internationalism, which
- 1 Safeguards small countries.
- C There is a probability of revolt if independence is not forthcoming at an early date.
- 1 The Filipinos have fought for independence before, and probably would again.
  - 2 They feel that the United States is not dealing justly, in reality violating a solemn pledge.
  - 3 Any attempt at revolt on the part of the Filipinos would have a disturbing influence that would be wide felt.
- D The general world conditions are favorable for Philippine independence.
- 1 There is peace in the Pacific.

- 2 The friendly relations between the more powerful nations, interested in Pacific affairs, is favorable for the general welfare of the world.

III. The Philippines have met the requirements for independence set by the United States Government.

A The requirement was the establishment of a stable government, which is

- 1 A government "capable of maintaining order and observing its international obligations, insuring peace and tranquility and the security of its citizens as well as our own." (President McKinley.)

2 The above interpretation is practically the same as that given by the League of Nations.

3 There is no room for argument on the reasonable interpretation of the term used, and this interpretation is fair for both affirmative and negative.

B The evidences that the Filipinos have established a stable government, are

1 Absence of trouble over elections.

(a) Quietness in selecting officials and placing them in office.

(b) Acceptance by the people of decisions as given through elections.

2 Internal peace prevails.

(a) The people are willing subjects to civil authority.

3 The active work of the governmental departments is being carried on harmoniously.

(a) The Philippine Legislature is conducted with probably as much decorum as any Legislature in the world.

(b) The people have confidence in the government departments and are conforming to the established system without undue protest.

### **Reference Material on Philippine Independence**

Brief History of the Philippines. L. H. Fernandez.

Cornerstone of Philippine Independence. F. B. Harrison.

Outlook for the Philippines. C. E. Russell.

### **Magazine Articles**

America's Pledge to the Philippines. M. L. Quezon. Asia, Vol. 21, November, 1921, p. 912.

America's Precedent for Mandates. C. S. Lobingier. Review of Reviews, Vol. 61, January, 1920, p. 60-62.

Are the Filipinos Prepared for Independence? F. G. Miller. Outlook, Vol. 127, April 13, 1921, p. 593-95.

Balance Sheet of the Philippines. Outlook, Vol. 130, January 4, 1922, p. 18-19.

Chinese Eyes on the Philippines. Literary Digest, August 6, 1921, p. 22-23.

Defending the Spanish Language Against Us. Literary Digest, April 14, 1923, p. 30-31.

Defense of the Philippines. B. A. Fiske. North American Review, Vol. 213, June, 1921, p. 721-24.

Do the Philippines Want Independence? E. F. Egan. Saturday Evening Post, October 15, 1921, p. 16.

Education and the Future of the Philippines. O. G. Jones. Review of Reviews, Vol. 64, October, 1921, p. 405-14.

Eliminating the American. E. F. Egan. Saturday Evening Post, August 27, 1921, p. 6-7.

Filipino Independence and Moro Domination. D. S. Root. Current History Magazine, Vol. 13, part 2, March, 1921, p. 441-48.

Filipino Ire at Uncle Sam. Literary Digest, October 28, 1922, p. 17-18.

Filipinos Think Their Time of Probation Has Ended. Current Opinion, Vol. 66, May, 1919, p. 276-78.



Friendly Estimate of the Philippines. Review of Reviews, Vol. 64, December, 1921, p. 653-54.

Future of the Philippines. C. E. Russell. Contemporary Review, Vol. 122, December, 1922, p. 750-59.

Ghost of Imperialism. Bellman, Vol. 26, May 10, 1919, p. 512.

Independence for the Philippines. Literary Digest, April 19, 1919, p. 9-11.

Japan and Filipino Independence. Literary Digest, July 16, 1921, p. 19.

Malolos Constitution. A Filipino Attempt at Constitution Making. G. A. Malcolm. Political Science Quarterly, Vol. 36, March, 1921, p. 91-103.

No Need of Haste in the Independence of the Philippines. World's Work, Vol. 38, June, 1919, p. 126-27.

Now is the Time to Solve the Philippine Problem. G. Nieva. Outlook, Vol. 129, September 28, 1921, p. 135-37.

Our Own Little Ireland in the Philippines. Literary Digest, June 4, 1921, p. 40-44.

Philippines and Sea Power. W. H. Gardner. North American Review, Vol. 216, August, 1922, p. 165-73.

Philippine Independence Put Off. Literary Digest, December 10, 1921, p. 7-8.

Philippines: Independent or Vassal? C. E. Russell. *Nation*, Vol. 114, April 26, 1922, p. 487-88.

Philippine Situation. G. Nieva. *Saturday Evening Post*, February 21, 1920, p. 40-63.

Philippine Independence. *Nation*, Vol. 108, June 28, 1918, p. 1028-30.

Philippine Independence. M. L. Quezon. *Asia*, Vol. 19, May, 1919, p. 427-28.

Philippine Independence Movement. M. M. Kalaw. *Current History Magazine*, Vol. 10, part 2, July, 1919, p. 127-30.

Philippines Inside Out. G. Emerson. *Asia*, Vol. 21, November, 1921, p. 902-11.

Philippine Republic. C. H. Sherrill. *Scribner's Magazine*, Vol. 67, April, 1920, p. 480-88.

Philippine View of the Jones Bill. *Review of Reviews*, Vol. 54, August, 1916, p. 221-22.

Playing Fair With the Filipinos. O. G. Jones. *Asia*, Vol. 21, March, 1921, p. 245-50

Plight and Hope of the Philippines. W. Robb. *North American Review*, Vol. 215, June, 1922, p. 761-66.

Preserving the Philippines. E. F. Egan. *Saturday Evening Post*, October 1, 1921, p. 11.

President Benton's Plans for the University of the Philippines. *School and Society*, Vol. 15, April 1, 1922, p. 360.

Promise of the Philippines. M. Kalaw. Asia, Vol. 19, May, 1919, p. 428-33.

Report of the Philippine Commission. Current History Magazine, Vol. 15, January, 1922, p. 678-94.

Stability in Public Service. S. C. Eastman. North American Review, Vol. 216, October, 1922, p. 576.

Toward a Philippine Republic. Nation, Vol. 116, January 17, 1923, p. 80.

Toward Philippine Freedom. Nation, Vol. 115, September 13, 1922, p. 260-65.

Trade of the Philippine Islands, 1899-1919. Pan American Magazine, Vol. 29, May, 1919, p. 27-28.

Uncle Sam Has Been a Benevolent Relative to the Filipinos. Literary Digest, June 28, 1919, p. 78-80.

Why the Filipinos Desire Independence? M. L. Quezon. Current History Magazine, Vol. 15, November, 1921, p. 239-45.

Why Japan Does Not Want the Philippines. Review of Reviews, Vol. 51, April, 1915, p. 494.

Wood's Philippines After One Year's Work. W. Robb. Outlook, Vol. 133, January 31, 1923, p. 219-20.

Yesterday and Today in the Philippines. C. R. Hamilton. Missionary Review of the World, Vol. 45, October, 1922, p. 801-10.

### **Developing the Brief**

With a detailed brief the affirmative is ready to prepare a discussion. Some speakers prefer to fill in more details than are given in the brief contained in this chapter. That is a matter of preference, the object of this chapter being to show the essentials rather than attempting to add all possible or valuable details.

The division of the subject depends on the number of speakers. We will say that there are to be three speakers on each side. Since there are to be three speakers and there are three issues that appears to be one issue for each speaker. However, an examination will show that this is not a logical method for dividing. The bulk of the debate is centered on the issue of the Filipinos being ready for self-government—independence. A logical division is for the first speaker to take up the introduction and points A and B under the first issue; the second speaker to take up points C, D, E, F and G under the first main heading, while the third speaker discusses both the second and third issues. This so divides the subject that each has about the same amount of ground to cover and the speeches fit in well with each other. There needs to be unity of the separate speeches as well as unity in each individual speech.

The discussion that follows has not been divided. It is presented as though one speaker dis-

cussed the entire subject briefly. This speech should be studied to determine what should be added to it to make it stronger—a better defense of the proposition. Is there sufficient reference to authorities? What of the authorities used? Is there enough refutation? What parts should be emphasized more? What important things have been omitted? Does the speech contain anything that is irrelevant? Does it have unity throughout? How might this subject matter be used by three speakers? How could it be divided and the parts then held together so that an audience would keep the entire discussion well in mind?

### **Affirmative Discussion**

The question for debate is, *Resolved*, That the United States Should Immediately Grant Complete Independence to the Philippine Islands. By complete independence is meant that the United States shall not be a party to any agreement concerning the independence of the Philippines, but shall make the Islands absolutely free, without retaining any authority whatever, or assuming any responsibility as to the future welfare of the people.

The United States has been vitally interested in the Philippine Islands since 1898. Previous to this time the Philippines had been held for more than three centuries by the Spanish, though the

people had never been fully conquered, and the Spaniards had much difficulty in maintaining their authority. Attempts at throwing off the Spanish yoke had been frequent, though not successful. In 1898 the inhabitants of the Islands were engaged in another attempt to gain their independence. The spirit of revolution prevailed.

The Spanish-American war resulted in the United States pushing the war into the Pacific and capturing the Philippines. The treaty of peace assigned Spain's rights to the United States. Immediately the question arose as to what should be done with the Islands. It was believed by some that the people should be given their freedom and permitted to set up an independent government. Two reasons made this appear to be the wrong solution. First, it was known that other powers had their eyes on the Philippines and would probably attempt to gain possession if America withdrew; second, it was recognized that the Filipinos themselves were not sufficiently developed as a people to organize a stable self-government. In recognition of these factors the United States retained the Islands as a duty to the world and to the Filipinos.

Retaining the Islands, it should do something for the people, and the policy was adopted of educating the Filipinos and preparing them for self-government. A school system was established and

this has gradually developed as the people have made advancement.

Independence being the ultimate aim, the people were gradually given more governmental authority. Four periods of development are outstanding as stated by the Wood-Forbes Commission which investigated Philippine conditions in 1921. The rapidity with which one period has followed another indicates a rapid development of the people. First was the military period from August 13, 1898, to July 1, 1901, during which time the American government compelled the people to recognize its authority; second was the organization period from July 1, 1901, to October 16, 1907, during which time the Philippine Commission appointed by the President of the United States had sole legislative authority. In 1907 the Filipinos were given control of the lower branch of the legislature and were used extensively in governmental affairs. This was the third period which lasted until 1914, when the fourth period began with giving the Filipinos a majority in the upper house. Two years later the Jones Act gave the people full control of the legislature, the legislators to be elected by the so-called Christian element of the population. This act permitted the removal of American government officials, and the substitution of Filipinos, except that the head of the govern-

ment would continue to be The Governor-General appointed by the President of the United States; and that the Vice-Governor and the Secretary of Public Instruction should be Americans.

The Jones Act specified that the Philippines should become independent as soon as the Filipinos had established a stable government. Agitation for independence began shortly after the passage of this act by the Filipinos, who believed that they had met the requirements of the Jones Act. In fact agitation for independence began long before the end of the Spanish regime, and when the Jones Act made a definite promise the people were soon ready to demand the fulfillment of the pledge. A number of the leading Filipinos, with Manuel L. Quezon at the head of the delegation, visited America in 1919, making a plea for independence. Quezon is President of the Philippine Senate, which position he has held since the reorganization following the passage of the Jones Act. The Mission expected to be favorably received, but was disappointed. The American government was not ready to acknowledge that the Philippines were ready for self-government.

President Wilson's message to Congress in 1920 requested that independence be granted to the Philippines since the people had succeeded in establishing a stable government as required in the Jones Act. Nothing came of this recommenda-



tion and the agitation for independence has continued. Appropriations have been made annually by the Philippine legislature to carry on independence agitation, while other Missions have come to America to present their case.

In 1921, President Harding appointed General Leonard Wood, who had formerly served in the Philippines, and W. Cameron Forbes, one time Governor-General of the Philippines, to make a thorough investigation of Philippine conditions. These gentlemen reported that in their estimation the Filipinos had not yet had sufficient experience to be trusted with their self-government, but that they were making good advancement.

Permission has since been requested of Congress for a grant of authority to draft a constitution to show what kind of government the people want to establish.

With this historical background the affirmative presents to you three issues. Are the Filipinos ready for self government? Would the independence of the Philippines now have a detrimental influence on world affairs? Have the Philippines met the requirements for independence set by the United States government in the Jones Act?

The affirmative maintains that independence should be granted to the Philippines because:

first, the Filipinos are ready for self government; second, the independence of the Philippines would not have a detrimental influence on world affairs; third, the requirements for independence set by the United States government have been met.

In support of the contention that the Filipinos are ready for self-government the affirmative presents the following for your consideration:

First, there is unity among the people. Gregoria Nieva, editor of the Philippine Review, in an article in *The Saturday Evening Post*, February 21, 1920, asserts that in spite of their differences, the people of the Islands are all Filipinos just as we in America are Americans in spite of our differences.

The Filipinos are held together by the racial instincts, the vast majority belonging to the Malay race.

The various tribes have much in common although there are naturally differences as there are differences in every nation in the world. There is unity in supporting one legislature, only the few listed as non-Christian not taking part, and these are not permitted to do so by the Jones Act. The school system has been nationalized and shows that the people are of one mind in this respect as concerns the general principles. Commercial interests are such as hold the people together. The most significant fact of all is that of tribal ideals

giving place to a national Filipino spirit. With this evidence before us, should we not come to the reasonable conclusion that there is unity among the people? If this does not mean unity where can we find it?

Second, there is a growth of a universal language. English was adopted as the language for the school system, because the people were speaking many dialects, and to develop harmony it was essential that they have one language. English being the language of America it was only natural that this should be chosen, and an additional reason was the fact that it has been growing in favor as the trade language of the East. The people are getting in close touch with it through their commercial and other activities. It is the language of the schools, being continued since the Filipinos have more to say about their own affairs. While dialects and other languages still continue, English is becoming the language of the land, and with a single language in use all over the Islands the people have a common basis for a common understanding which is essential to successful self-government.

Third, the people want independence. This is indicated in various ways. The Wood-Forbes report states that some do not want independence, while President Harding in 1922 made the statement in his reply to the plea for Philippine inde-

pendence addressed to him by Manuel L. Quezon that he receives petitions against independence. This might appear that the people do not want independence, but the President did not state that the petitions represented any large percentage of the people. While the Wood-Forbes report states that some do not want independence it makes it clear that the opposition is from the non-Christian and American classes. It says, "We find everywhere among Christian Filipinos the desire for independence," and this report lists the Christians as consisting of 9,350,240 of the inhabitants of the Islands. With this vast number favoring independence it may be reasonably assumed that independence is the desire of the country.

The legislators who favor independence and who work for it are re-elected by the people. The action of the legislature in appropriating funds each year to be used in the agitation for independence, this action being approved by the people who supply the funds, indicates that the people so much desire independence that they are willing for their money to be used for the purpose.

Charles Edward Russell, who has spent years in the Philippines, in an article on "The Philippines: Independent or Vassal?" published in the April 26, 1922, edition of *The Nation*, answers the claim that the Moros do not desire independence by stating that he has found the opposite to

be true. He says, "When I was in the Moro country I could never detect that the general feeling about independence was different from that in the northern provinces, and I have letters from representative Moros assuring me that it is not. At Zamboanga in the beautiful public square they were building a monument to Rizal as handsome as any other in the country; in all ways they seemed to have for his memory no less a reverence than their northern fellow countrymen. Rizal is the national hero of the independence cause; hence I am obliged to regard this fact as more significant than any off-hand statements."

Should any considerable portion of the Filipinos be opposed to independence such opposition would doubtless have an influence that would augur the defeat of self-government, but with such opposition lacking there is reason to believe that with the privilege of independence being granted to them the people would zealously strive to make their independence a force in the development of a still stronger national spirit than now exists.

Fourth, the probability of Moro domination is slight. The Moros have been feared in the past because of their savage natures, but a change has come to these people also as well as to others. American occupation has not been without its effect on the Moro people. They have been

touched by civilizing influences and are no longer the terrible people that they were; they no longer present the grave governmental problems which were one time a part of the portion of country in which they dwell.

The Moros are of the same race as other Filipinos, they are Filipinos, and racial instincts serve to promote relationships which are not unfriendly to others. It is true that their religion is different, but a difference in religion does not indicate domination, for different religions have long lived together in peace and harmony. There is especially little danger of the domination which some fear for the Moros are few in number, not more than four per cent of the Filipinos belonging to this class.

Fifth, the efficiency of the people indicate that they are ready for self-government. That efficiency has been demonstrated in various ways. At first they were not given a part in governmental affairs for they needed to be educated. Gradually the Filipinos were placed in government positions and the extension of the program of placing Filipinos in authority is proof that the American government found the natives capable of handling the affairs entrusted to their care. They proved their fitness which has been acknowledged by America in gradually extending the authority of the natives.

The people have demonstrated their efficiency in professional and industrial activity, showing marked ability. The Filipinos are an alert people. They have excellent mental capacity. They make rapid advancement in school. The primary and intermediate schools cover approximately the same ground as the first eight grades of the American schools, and while the average American child takes eight years for the work, the Philippine school system provides for the covering of this ground in seven years. The ability shown in the secondary and higher schools is quite marked.

It is sometimes asserted that Filipino ability is confused with the proficiency of American supervision, and that without this supervision the natives would not have made as good a showing as they have in the past quarter of a century. Granted that American supervision has been beneficial, this does not do away with the fact that nevertheless it was the ability of the natives that enabled the Americans to obtain satisfactory results through the supervision. Results have been dependent on the ability of the people.

With the ability the Filipinos manifest it is evident that they could successfully master the problems of self-government.

Sixth, the Filipinos are able to defend themselves. They have military ability. They served willingly during the world war and were good

soldiers. They demonstrated their fighting qualities shortly after the United States took possession of the Islands, they had demonstrated those qualities before, and their training since America took possession has made them keener minded, so that they have the additional advantage of highly-developed mental capacity.

The Islands would be difficult to conquer. The Spaniards never succeeded in conquering them during their centuries of occupation. The natural defenses are to the advantage of the residents and to the great disadvantage of any who would attempt to wage a conquest. The Filipinos would prove a formidable foe to any enemy violating their rights as an independent nation.

Seventh, race prejudice is responsible for much of the opposition to independence. Americans are not inclined to recognize the ability of the Filipinos to govern themselves. The weaknesses are pointed out and the strong elements overlooked. We can find weaknesses in any government that exists in the world, our own included. We overlook our own shortcomings while we find fault with others.

Race prejudice could be expected to have an influence on the Philippine question for wherever two or more races come into close contact with each other such prejudice always exists. The



Americans do not want to be governed by Filipinos nor do they want to leave the Islands, largely because of economic advantage, so they stay on, and protest against independence, holding out lack of capacity on the part of the natives. The chief opposition to independence comes from Americans at home or in the Philippines, and in considering that opposition we must recognize the existence of the prejudice which weakens the position taken by the opponents of that which the Filipinos so much desire, and which the affirmative contends they should be permitted to enjoy.

The independence of the Philippines would not have a detrimental influence on world affairs.

First, the danger of tempting some other power is negligible. The Filipinos are prepared to defend themselves as has already been shown.

Much has been made of the probability of Japan attempting to take the Islands if they should be made free. For several years this has been agitated against the protests of Japan and against the belief of the Filipinos. Naturally Japan would protest against such agitation, so that the mere protest can have little weight, but there is reason for believing that Japan would make no effort to take the Philippine Islands even though the United States would withdraw. Japan has never taken territory unless it is something that she feels that she needs. She does not recog-

nize the need of possessing the Philippines. The climate is not agreeable to her people. Most of those who have migrated to the Philippines have returned to their native land. The Philippines do not have the minerals that Japan needs to develop her industries. Why would Japan want the Islands? If she did want them she would have great difficulty in capturing them and subjecting them to her authority. The natives would resist bitterly. The cost to Japan would not be worth the effort. Should Japan busy herself with a military campaign of aggression she would have trouble in another quarter of the globe. Korea is held against her will and would in all probability take the first opportunity to throw off the yoke should Japan be engaged in any serious military campaign in some other section of the world. But Japan is not seeking to assume a place of ill repute in the world that would be her lot should she attempt to take the Philippines. She wants the good will of the world, and this is a safeguard for the Islands, even though her inclination might be to take them.

There was a time when, unmistakably, Germany wanted the Philippines, but that time has passed, and no nation is looking on them as prey. There is no indication of any power wanting to take the Philippines at the present time. Granting these Islands their independence would not

likely disturb world affairs by reason of any attempted conquest.

Second, the world is enjoying a new spirit of internationalism which is a safeguard to small countries. This spirit is not just what we would like to have it, but the improvement over the spirit that existed a decade or two ago is marked.

Third, if the Islands are not given their independence soon there is a probability of revolt. The leaders of revolutions during the Spanish domination are the heroes whom the Filipinos love to honor at the present time. They have fought for independence and probably would do so again. They feel that the United States is not dealing justly with them, that America has violated a solemn pledge, and with such feelings and with the bitterness increasing with renewed determination to win independence there can be no expectation of holding the people down indefinitely. No intelligent, educated people have ever been held long as vassals of another people without a struggle for independence, and we cannot expect the Philippine Islands to be the one exception. Any attempt would have a most disturbing effect on world affairs which would be precluded by granting independence.

Fourth, the general world conditions are favorable for Philippine independence. The agitation for independence preceded the world

war, but the Filipinos recognized that while that war was on, disturbing the peace of the Pacific as well as of other sections of the world, that it was unwise to attempt to start an independent commonwealth. That situation has been cleared up largely. The war is over, and while peace and harmony does not exist everywhere, while there are serious conditions in various parts of the world, the friendly relations between the more powerful nations interested in Pacific affairs show that in the Pacific at least there is a basis for peace. Conditions are favorable as concerning the Pacific, Japan, the United States, and Great Britain having reached a common understanding of the value of peace. This augurs for a continuation of peaceful world affairs with the Philippines free as well as with them under the supervision of the United States.

Last of all the affirmative contends that the Philippines have met the requirements for independence set by the United States.

The Jones Act promised independence, at least it was so regarded by both America and the Philippines. It specified that independence should follow the establishment of a stable government. Such a government was interpreted by President McKinley in reference to Cuba as being a government "capable of maintaining

order and observing its international obligations, insuring peace and tranquility and the security of its citizens as well as our own." That definition is practically the same in meaning as agreed upon by the League of Nations. It is a fair definition, fair to both affirmative and negative, fair to the Philippines and America—it is a fair test.

The evidence indicates that the Filipinos have established a stable government. President Wilson believed that they had when he sent his message to Congress in 1920 asking that Congress grant independence to the Islands.

What are the evidences that a stable government has been established?

First, there is absence of trouble over elections. For a government whose officials are elected to hold peaceful elections is a good indication of stability, for elections are a fruitful source of trouble. We find this to be true in America so what could we expect but some disturbance or improper action. That fraud has been practiced, especially in the early elections, is an established fact, but in our enlightened America fraud still exists after nearly a century and a half of national existence. The improvement in the situation in recent years is noteworthy. However, at all times there has been quiet in the selecting of officials and placing them in office, and while the minority has been no better satisfied than the minority is

anywhere there has been an acceptance by the people of decisions as given through elections.

Second, internal peace prevails. The people are willing subjects to civil authority. The Wood-Forbes report states that "Public order is excellent throughout the Islands with the exception of minor disturbances in the Moro regions." Internal peace is a reasonably good indication of stability in government.

Third, the active work of the government departments is being carried on harmoniously. The legislature is conducted with decorum. After being a fairly regular attendant of legislative sessions, Charles Edward Russell says in his book *The Outlook for the Philippines*, page 132, that the legislature "appeared to rank high among the legislative bodies of civilization."

The people have confidence in the government departments and are conforming to the established system without undue protest, which is an indication of stability in the government that has been established.

The Wood-Forbes commission in 1921 did not believe that the Filipinos were ready for independence, largely because of a lack of experience. It was acknowledged that they were learning rapidly, and even though we might accept the statement that they were not ready for independence then, the advancement they have made

since would change the situation. The fact that the Commission was sent to the Islands was indicative of a general belief that the people were almost ready for independence at that time, but the government did not want to make the change too soon. The advancement since has unquestionably made it expedient to grant the Philippines their independence immediately, especially is this reasonable since the belief was entertained by many including President Wilson that the Philippines were ready for independence when Wood and Forbes went to the Islands.

Having produced evidence tending to prove that the Filipinos are ready for self-government, that granting independence to the Philippines would no longer disturb world affairs, and that the people have unquestionably met the demand of the United States before they would be given their freedom, the affirmative contends that it has, beyond a reasonable doubt, proven that the Philippine Islands should be immediately given complete independence.

.

**PART THREE**



**Model Arguments**





## CHAPTER VI

### MODEL ARGUMENTS

The specimen arguments presented in this chapter are for close study. These illustrate the various kinds of argument mentioned in Chapter III.

The first is a specimen of exposition. Such argument has an important place in debating, though the debater should not resort to this form only as has been done in the discussion that follows. Exposition should clear the ground, but should not attempt to also take the place of analysis and the determining of issues. The speaker should not assume that his audience will grasp the issues without these being clearly set forth. He should reveal his exact purpose and show by a process of logical reasoning that he has accomplished his purpose step by step. The following specimen of exposition, though argumentative, would be reasonably good as an editorial or magazine article, but is not a first-class debate, being an example of exposition carried too far for that purpose.

#### 1

#### **Necessity for Legitimate Japanese Expansion**

To get the proper viewpoint of the Japanese

situation, Japan must be studied geographically, historically, and economically.

The Empire is approximately the size of the state of Texas with a population three-quarters that of the United States. Leaving out the annexed country of Korea, Japan is a little larger than the state of Montana, with a population considerably more than one-half that of the United States. China is a densely populated country, but if all the people of the world were living within its borders it would then be only about as densely populated as is Japan proper at the present time.

The "Land of Cherry Blossoms" is frequently spoken of as having a rich, fertile soil, but this is an erroneous impression, for the soil is largely made up of the sandy substances of old shales and granites, and satisfactory crops can only be produced with the aid of persistent and intense fertilizing. A large portion of the country is mountainous so that all the land of the Islands suitable for agricultural purposes is less than half that of the state of Iowa, and on this limited area more than thirty million people depend exclusively on agriculture for their livelihood.

The natural resources of Japan are very limited. There are no heavy deposits of coal or

iron ore, which are so essential to the development of an industrial commonwealth.

Omitting many centuries of legendary narratives, the Island Empire has an authentic history covering more than fifteen hundred years, and during a considerable portion of this time the people have lived in nominal isolation. Western civilization was admitted for a time, then shut out completely for two centuries until Commodore Perry, of the United States, knocked at the gates with a demand that the period of isolation cease and the open door policy be inaugurated. This was in the fall of 1853. Early the next year the Commodore with his fleet of battle ships went back for his answer. The Japanese in consternation gave a favorable reply, and from that time have occupied a somewhat different status among the nations of the world, although the statesmen of other nations would then have scorned the idea of these little people ever becoming a great world power.

The first serious difficulty with a foreign country was over the Korean peninsula. This peninsula, as the Japanese say, points like a dagger at the heart of their empire, and it has always been their belief that if Korea could not be independent it must be controlled by Japan for their personal safety. China was rapidly acquiring control of the peninsula, which eventually,

led to the China-Japan War, in 1894. As a result of this war, fought to keep China from controlling Korea, Japan secured Formosa, Port Arthur, Dairen, and valuable concessions, including an indemnity. Within less than a week after the treaty was signed, Russia, backed up by Germany and France, kindly suggested that Japan renounce possession of the peninsula of Liaotung, which included valuable Port Arthur. Naturally the Japanese were reluctant to do so, but realizing that they were helpless in the face of the demands of three western powers, conceded to the expressed wishes of those who claimed to be acting only in the interests of Eastern peace.

However, Japan was not convinced that Russia was acting unselfishly and when, in 1898, Russia secured from China, Manchurian concessions along with Port Arthur, the wrath of the Japanese was not concealed. A year later Russia attempted to secure possession of a Korean port, but failed to do so. Japan saw clearly that she must eventually deal with the northern bear. She saw also other countries gaining valuable concessions in China—ports, mining concessions, etc. She saw that they were able to do this because of their military strength, and consequently she adopted a military program herself. In 1902 Japan formed an alliance with England, and in 1904, after diplomacy failed to adjust the differences be-

tween herself and Russia, the Russia-Japan war opened suddenly. During this war Japan showed an amazing strength, and the treaty of peace at its close gave Japan authority over Korea, and transferred the Russian rights in the Liaotung Peninsula, along with the railway concession rights and other rights in Manchuria.

The world was beginning to recognize Japan as a power to be reckoned with. A few years later, in 1910, Japan declared Korea formally annexed to her empire, and at the beginning of the late world war gained possession of German holdings in China as well as taking the German islands in the Pacific, and was able to sit at the Peace Table in 1919 as one of the great powers of the world. Japan emerged from the world war a much stronger military power than she was a decade before, and with strong military tendencies in a world that is trying to get away from militarism. Nor is this strange. Japan has learned from the western nations. She has adopted western customs, and she has taken from the western ideas what she has considered as most beneficial to the western people during seventy years of mad scrambling for land in which time the strong nations of the west added some thirteen million square miles to their domains. The most striking thing that Japan saw regarding the western powers was their military strength. It was

with a fleet of battleships that Commodore Perry, of the United States, visited their country. It was through the military strength of Russia and England and France and Germany that she witnessed their securing of valuable concessions in China. It was with a military force that the United States took Manila, the taking of which led to the transfer of the Philippines to this country. Japan saw nations take territory and win concessions who had the strength of military power back of them, and she concluded that militarism must be an essential element of expansion.

Japan saw nations more favorably situated than herself taking concessions under the name of necessity and reasoned that she had more need for expansion than others. On the foundation of such reasoning, and looking on a world of military strength, rapidly learning and adopting western methods, awake to her needs and advantages, the development of militarism in Japan has been a natural outcome. Japan was a party to the disarmament agreement in 1922 and has shown that she is willing to limit armaments if others do, but that she will not consent to be classed other than as one of the leading military nations of the world.

The historical development of the empire since the visit of our Commodore Perry has resulted in a condition with three angles: first, the

prejudice of other peoples against the Japanese; second, Japanese suspicion of the sincerity of other powers and the apparent belief that other powers are trying to keep the Japanese confined to their islands; third, the suspicions of other powers that the Japanese are not sincere.

The prejudice shown the Japanese by other peoples is too well known to need much comment, nor is it essential for the present moment to consider whether or not this prejudice is justified. However, it vitally affects the Japanese situation. Japan with her crowded islands has seen enormous possibilities in the United States, in Canada, in Australia, in South Africa, and in China, and in none of these places has she been given a welcome. She has had China, her near neighbor, object to granting similar concessions to her that have been granted to other powers; she has seen the hysteria of California, and the closing of the ports of other countries to her immigrants.

Japan has seen Russia, pleading to preserve the integrity of China, take over valuable Chinese territory. She has seen England and France, in the name of justice, obtain concession after concession from a helpless country. She has seen the hand of Germany in the East. She has seen the United States in the name of liberty hold the Philippines for a quarter of a century. And, irrespective of whether or not the course of her



reasoning was justified, she has read in these actions an insincerity on the part of other commonwealths.

As to the suspicion of other peoples that the Japanese are not sincere, the Japanese have only themselves to blame for it. The twenty-one demands made on China in 1915 were such that no independent power could concede. These were drafted into five sections, and what was supposed to be an identical copy was sent to England to comply with the terms of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, but, as stated in a quotation in George Gleason's book "What Shall I Think of Japan?" page 173, the copy sent to England only contained four sections of the demands. The demands themselves did not carry the marks of sincerity, while the copy sent to England is difficult to explain. In the Siberian expedition in 1918, in which the United States and Japan co-operated, Japan did not show the right spirit. Instead of sending the number of soldiers which had been agreed upon she sent in two additional armies of some sixty thousand men, keeping the fact a secret until it was eventually discovered. Furthermore, the insistent Japanese demands at the Peace Table in 1919 did not win her any friends.

There is some ground for the existence of the prejudice heretofore mentioned, as well as for the suspicions of the Japanese and the sus-

pitions of other powers regarding the Japanese. Nevertheless, exaggeration has been rampant while molehills have been magnified into mountains on both sides. Extravagant statements have been made of both a pro and anti Japanese attitude, so that a lack of complete understanding has resulted.

This lack of complete understanding with its many angles has a tendency to keep the Japanese confined to their islands, while the modern development of the people with their military strength and their vision and alertness is pushing against the wall of their narrow confines and makes more essential a legitimate opening in the wall that it be not bursted by the accumulation of excessive force within. Carbon may be compressed until it acquires the hardness of a diamond, but steam as an active force cannot be compressed in such a manner. Disaster would result from the attempt. The Japanese, as active forces in the modern world, cannot be confined to narrow limits. Should the nations desire to confine them, as the Japanese apparently fear is the intention, the result would be a disaster to the peace of the world and the welfare of humanity.

The Jap cannot live on the resources of his islands with a population already excessively large and increasing approximately three-quar-

ters of a million annually. Only a few million can subsist on the fishing industry, the agricultural possibilities are too limited to comfortably support even those who are now engaged in the occupation; while other natural resources are wholly inadequate for the development of a strong industrial commonwealth.

If immigration to Canada, America, Australia, South Africa, and other places is taboo; and it seems that such is to be the case, then some other form of legitimate expansion possibilities must relieve the tension. If immigration is out of the question, then the expansion must be industrially. England and Germany, with limited territory and a large population, have been able to live comfortably in their narrow confines because of industrial development, but both have been favored with valuable natural resources against Japan's limited resources, and it can hardly be said that the industrial growth of either was unaccompanied by expansion. The coal mines of Japan are being worked as extensively as consistent to the safeguarding of the future and yield a scant thirty million tons annually, against three hundred twenty-five million tons mined each year in England.

For a nation to enjoy a full measure of industrial development it must have an abundance of both iron and coal, whereas Japan has neither.

There are a few minor deposits in Korea, but not enough to materially relieve the situation. There are vast treasures of both coal and iron in China, and China has not the capital necessary to develop those resources. Coal in China, where there is enough to last the world fifteen hundred years, is being mined at the rate of little more than twenty million tons annually, about one-thirtieth of the amount mined in the United States, and a portion of that small amount is taken from Japanese developed Manchurian mines for the benefit of the Manchurian railway system.

It was to grasp opportunities for industrial expansion that Japan sent her twenty-one demands to China in 1915, but the other powers, with the United States in the lead, opposed such action on the part of Japan, and would not permit the execution of the demands. Japan was unjust, for her demands if granted would have undermined the foundation of Chinese independence. Nevertheless, Japan recognized that China could not develop her own resources in centuries, and that at Japan's very front door are the undeveloped resources so much needed by the island empire.

Five-sixths of the people of China live on one-third of the territory, while the remaining two-thirds is not utilized to any appreciable extent. Japan's meagre development in Manchuria

has furnished employment for thousands of Chinese, and has been a direct benefit to the Chinese people, so that it cannot be shown that Japanese industrial expansion via China would be a detriment to the Mongolian Republic.

It would not be necessary for Japan to set up extensive factories outside her own borders if she could be assured of having access at all times to an adequate supply of coal and iron, with such other materials as are absolutely essential. No industrial nation can safely depend on essentials being supplied by some other people. Past experience has taught the lesson that the industrial nation must control its own essential resources or not be a strong industrial commonwealth. At the time of our Civil War, England was depending largely on the United States furnishing cotton to keep her textile factories going, and when the continued war caused the cotton supply to fail it resulted in tremendous suffering. Since then England has done much to promote cotton growing in India and Egypt—within the borders of her own provinces—considering such action essential to her industrial well being. The mad scramble of nations to win oil concessions in various parts of the world is evidence of a general recognition that the industrial power must control its own essentials to be assured of a continuous supply. The nation dependent on another

nation is in an unfavorable position. Japan has tremendous industrial possibilities if she can be placed in touch with some source of supply which she can regulate in accordance with her needs, and this would not necessarily mean dominating over another people.

Canada, the United States, South Africa, and Australia have much room for immigrants. China has uncomprehendable resources undeveloped. Two avenues of possible expansion lead from the Japanese Empire, with both theoretically blocked. Japan would undoubtedly be content with either opened. One must be opened or Japan starve, and we can hardly expect a people with the spirit that Japan has manifested in recent decades starving without a struggle. When the western nations faced the necessity of expansion they expanded, and we can hardly expect less of the greatest nation of the East. Without expansion neither Germany nor England would have reached their state of vast industrial importance although both possessed enormous resources within their borders. How much more essential is expansion to the industrial growth of Japan with few home resources aside from man power.

It is for the nations to decide which avenue shall be opened. There is plenty in the world

for all to live in comfort if unselfish justice dominates international affairs.

## 2

### **Exposition to Clear Ground**

Immigration has not been restricted materially in the past. In 1864 Congress passed a law encouraging immigration to this country, offering immigrants freedom from compulsory military service and the aid of the Commissioner of Immigration in helping to get settled and in being protected from impositions. This law was repealed four years later, but the government was slow to pass restrictive measures. Asiatics were restricted near the close of the last century and an effort made to keep out various undesirable classes, nevertheless the influx of foreign element has been tremendous. No statistics were kept before 1820. From 1820 to 1830 there were 143,439 aliens admitted to the United States. During the next decade there were 599,125, and 1,713,251 between the years 1840 and 1850. Then for thirty years the average was approximately one-quarter of a million annually, from 1880 to 1890 the average was slightly more than half a million annually, during the next decade the average number of immigrants each year rose to nearly nine hundred thousand, while for the years 1911, 1912, 1913, and 1914 the average was more than a million annually. In spite of the

European war, immigrants continued to come, and after the war was over the number began to increase materially. More than thirty million immigrants were admitted to the United States during the ninety-year period following 1830, and this appears even more serious when we consider that approximately half that number were admitted during the last two decades of that ninety years. Does not rigid restriction appear necessary, in view of the fact that immigrants have been admitted by the millions during recent years and who have not become assimilated, if we are to preserve our American ideals and institutions?

### 3

#### **Burke's Use of Exposition**

"The trade with America alone is now within less than £500,000 of being equal to what this great commercial nation, England, carried on at the beginning of this century with the whole world. If I had taken the largest year of those on your table, it would rather have exceeded. But, it will be said, is not this American trade an unnatural protuberance, that has drawn the juices from the rest of the body? The reverse. It is the very food that has nourished every other part into its present magnitude. Our general trade has been greatly augmented more or less in every part to which it ever extended; but with this ma-



terial difference, that of the six millions which in the beginning of the century constituted the whole mass of our export commerce, the Colony trade was but one-twelfth part; it is now (as a part of sixteen millions) considerably more than a third of the whole. This is the relative proportion of the Colonies at these two periods; and all reasoning concerning our mode of treating them must have this proportion as its basis; or it is a reasoning weak, rotten, and sophistical."

#### 4

#### **Argument by Authority—Burke**

"To say nothing of their (the American Colonies) expenses in the Indian wars, and not to take their exertion in foreign ones so high as the supplies in 1695—not to go back to their public contributions in the year 1710—I shall begin to travel only where the journals give me light, resolving to deal in nothing but fact, authenticated by Parliamentary record, and to build myself wholly on that solid basis.

"On the 4th of April, 1748, a committee of the House came to the following resolution: 'Resolved: That it is the opinion of this Committee that it is just and reasonable that the several Provinces and Colonies of Massachusetts Bay, New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Rhode Island be reimbursed the expenses they have been

at in taking and securing to the Crown of Great Britain the Island of Cape Breton and its dependencies.'

"The expenses were immense for such Colonies. They were above £200,000 sterling; money first raised and advanced on their public credit.

"On the 28th of January, 1756, a message from the King came to us, to this effect: 'His Majesty, being sensible of the zeal and vigor with which his faithful subjects of certain Colonies in North America have exerted themselves in defense of his Majesty's just rights and possessions, recommends it to this House to take the same into their consideration, and to enable his Majesty to give them such assistance as may be a proper reward and encouragement.'

"On the 3d of February, 1756, the House came to a suitable resolution, expressed in words nearly the same as those of the message, but with the further addition, that the money then voted was as an encouragement to the Colonies to exert themselves with vigor. It will not be necessary to go through all the testimonies which your records have given to the truth of my resolutions. I will only refer you to the places in the Journals:

"Vol. XXVII—16th and 19th May, 1757.

"Vol. XXVIII—June 1st, 1758; April 26th and 30, 1759; March 26th and 31st, and April 28th, 1760; January 9th and 20th, 1761.

"Vol. XXIX—January 22d and 26th, 1762; March 14th and 17th, 1763.

"Here is the repeated acknowledgment of Parliament that the Colonies not only gave, but gave to satiety. This nation has formally acknowledged two things: first, that the Colonies had gone beyond their abilities, Parliament having thought it necessary to reimburse them; secondly, that they had acted legally and laudably in their grants of money, and their maintenance of troops, since the compensation is expressly given as reward and encouragement. Reward is not bestowed for acts that are unlawful; and encouragement is not held out to things that deserve reprehension. My resolution therefore does nothing more than collect into one proposition what is scattered through your Journals. I give you nothing but your own; and you cannot refuse in the gross what you have so often acknowledged in detail."

Burke used his argument to show that what the Colonies had done once they might be expected to do again if allowed to act on their own initiative, and also to refute the claims that America contributed nothing to the public welfare.

## 5

### Argument by Authority

The negative maintains that the Filipinos have not met the demands made upon them by

the Jones Act in that they should establish a stable government before given their independence. Shortly before the Wood-Forbes Commission left for the Philippines in 1921 on their tour of investigation, Florence G. Miller, after living nine years in the Philippines, wrote: "The Filipinos are not sufficiently developed to attain in two generations that which required many years of struggle and slow growth for the most intelligent and self-governing nations of the world. . . . . With careful thought and unselfish devotion, the United States Government must continue to guide the Philippine people, old in race, but young and inexperienced in government—in order that they may know and comprehend the responsibilities and obligations of a self-governing nation." *The Outlook*, April 13, 1921, page 595.

A few months later the Wood-Forbes report was completed and this report states, "We find that the Government is not reasonably free from those underlying causes which result in the destruction of Government. We find that a reasonable proportion of officials and employes are men of good character and ability, and reasonably faithful to the trust imposed upon them; but that the efficiency of the public service has fallen off, and that they are now relatively inefficient, due to lack of inspection and to the too

rapid transfer of control to officials who have not had the necessary time for proper training."

With such authorities as these holding that the Filipinos have not yet attained the rank of efficient governing officials we may well hesitate before we conclude that these people have met the demand of the American Government as expressed in the Jones Act. There is no commonwealth in the world today that is entirely free from underlying causes which result in the destruction of government, but the Wood-Forbes report makes it expressly clear that the Philippine Government "is not reasonably free from those underlying causes which result in the destruction of Government," and until the Philippine Government is reasonably free from those causes a stable government cannot exist.

## 6

### **Argument by Authority**

No well organized self-governing nation can be established when that people use a multiplicity of languages without a single language used by the great majority of people. This is a problem with which we are confronted in dealing with the Philippine situation. The American Government has tried to give the Filipinos a universal language and has succeeded to some extent, but sufficient time has not elapsed to make this language one that is in general use. The

people continue to speak their many tongues. Donald S. Root, after spending six years among the Filipinos, tells in an article published in the March, 1921, issue of *Current History Magazine* of the vast number of languages and dialects spoken. He tells also of his experience with teachers trained in the government schools, who were supposed to teach English, but who spoke such "gibberish" that "it was almost impossible to understand them." The Wood-Forbes report is authority for the statement that there are forty-three tribes or groups speaking eighty-seven distinct dialects. While this condition exists it is expecting more than reason allows to expect a well-organized, unified, self-governing commonwealth to be established.

## 7

### **Refutation by Use of Authority**

In Lincoln's first inaugural address he resorted to the citation of authority to refute the claims made that the property and peace of the south would be endangered by a Republican administration.

Lincoln said, "Apprehension seems to exist among the people of the Southern States that by the accession of a Republican administration their property and their peace and personal security are to be endangered. There has never been any reasonable cause for such apprehension. Indeed,

the most ample evidence to the contrary has all the while existed and been open to their inspection. It is found in nearly all the published speeches of him who now addresses you. I do but quote from one of those speeches when I declare that 'I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so.' Those who nominated and elected me did so with full knowledge that I had made this and many similar declarations, and have never recanted them. And, more than this, they placed in the platform for my acceptance, and as a law to themselves and to me, the clear and emphatic resolution which I now read:

"Resolved, That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend, and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes.

"I now reiterate these sentiments; and, in doing so, I only press upon the public attention the most conclusive evidence of which the case

is susceptible, that the property, peace, and security of no section are to be in any wise endangered by the now incoming administration."

## 8

### Analogy

The affirmative in upholding the proposition that the United States Government should own and control all telegraph and telephone lines of the country calls your attention to the success of the Post Office Department. The affairs of this department are not conducted perfectly, and yet they are conducted about as well as could be expected of anything controlled by human minds. The service rendered is excellent with some rare exceptions. The government has accomplished much through its Parcel Post system, supplying a transportation system at a very low cost to the public. The rapidity with which mail is handled and the moderate cost is evidence of the ability of the government to render first-class service at a moderate price. The welfare of the public is given first consideration, and continuous service is one of the achievements that is especially noteworthy. No public service corporation has ever rendered so good a service at so nominal a cost or achieved so excellent a record of continuous service. What the government has accomplished in the Post Office Department it could doubtless



accomplish with the telephone and telegraph systems of the country. The success in one field points to success in the other. Its interest in the public welfare and its economical rates as shown in the Post Office Department would doubtless be extended to the telephone and telegraph service. We have reason to expect this. We would not be experimenting in government ownership and operation of lines of communication. The Post Office Department renders a service in communication, the government has had experience, and that experience points to success should it extend its service. The success in one line presages success in the other.

## 9

### Analogy

The affirmative maintains that the government ownership of railroads would go far toward the solution of our railway problems. Government ownership of roads is not a new thing in America. Our neighbor to the north, Canada, has government owned lines. These have given reasonable satisfaction, and what Canada has accomplished in this respect surely the United States can accomplish also. The United States is a progressive country, but in some things we are certainly behind others. While nations in Europe and Canada on this side of the Atlantic have gone ahead with a program of government ownership

and control of railroads the United States has lagged behind. Others have pointed the way. It is but for us to follow and we can follow with assurance since the experience of railway ownership in other countries has pointed out what can be done in our own country.

### **Fallacy Shown**

The affirmative would have you believe that the United States should own and control the railroads of the country because the government of Canada owns railway lines while government ownership of railroads is not unknown in Europe also. The affirmative contends that these experiments have been satisfactory. Granted that satisfaction has been the result, although evidence to the contrary can be submitted, we must recognize the differences involved. One case does not prove another unless the points of difference are negligible. No other country has the same railway problems to solve that we have. Our system is extensive. More than one-third of all the railroad lines in the world are within the borders of the United States. The intricate and complicated system is unlike any other anywhere. It is the most gigantic industrial enterprise in the world. The gross revenues of the railway lines exceed those of the federal government. There is nothing in the way of government owned railroads that can be compared to the railroads of the United States.

The points of difference will not allow the acceptance of the analogy as sound argument.

## 10

### **Analogy Used in Refutation**

During the debate on the Constitution of the United States, while it was being drafted, the question of portioning representation among the respective states was discussed at some length. Benjamin Franklin wrote his views on the subject, and his paper was read, being one of the few documents retained showing the exact language used in the long debates on the proposed constitution.

Franklin said, "I must own that I was originally of the opinion it would be better if every member of Congress, or our national council, were to consider himself rather as a representative of the whole than as an agent for the interests of a particular state; in which case the proportion of membership for each state would be of less consequence, and it would not be very material whether they voted by states or individually. But as I find this is not to be expected, I now think the number of representatives should bear some proportion to the number of the represented, and that the decisions should be by the majority of members, not by the majority of the states. This is objected to from an apprehension that the greater states would then swallow up the smaller. I do not at present clearly see what advantage the greater states could

propose to themselves by swallowing up the smaller, and therefore do not apprehend they would attempt it. I recollect that, in the beginning of this century, when the union was proposed in the two kingdoms, England and Scotland, the Scotch patriots were full of fears, that, unless they had an equal number of representatives in Parliament, they should be ruined by the superiority of the English. They finally agreed, however, that the different proportions of importance in the union of the two nations should be attended to, whereby they were to have only forty members in the House of Commons, and only sixteen in the House of Lords—a very great inferiority of numbers. And yet to this day I do not recollect that anything has been done in the Parliament of Great Britain to the prejudice of Scotland; and whoever looks over the lists of public officers, civil and military, of that nation, will find, I believe, that the North Britons enjoy at least their full proportion of emolument."

## 11

### **Strengthening the Debate by the Admitting of Material**

Lincoln in his debate with Douglas demonstrated how one strengthens rather than weakens his position by admitting all that is possible. He said in his speech at Peoria, Illinois, October 16, 1854:

“When Southern people tell us they are no more responsible for the origin of slavery than we are, I acknowledge the fact. When it is said that the institution exists, and that it is very difficult to get rid of in any satisfactory way, I can understand and appreciate the saying. I surely will not blame them for not doing what I should not know how to do myself. If all earthly power were given me, I should not know what to do as to the existing institution. My first impulse would be to free all the slaves, and send them to Liberia, to their own native land. But a moment's reflection would convince me that whatever of high hope (as I think there is) there may be in this in the long run, its sudden execution is impossible. If they were all landed there in a day, they would all perish in the next ten days; and there are not surplus shipping and surplus money enough to carry them there in many times ten days. What then? Free them all, and keep them among us as underlings? Is it quite certain that this betters their condition? I think I would not hold one in slavery at any rate, yet the point is not clear enough for me to denounce people upon. What then? Free them, and make them politically and socially our equals? My own feelings will not admit of this, and if mine would, we well know that those of the great mass of whites will not. Whether this feeling accords with justice and sound judgment is not the

sole question, if indeed it is any part of it. A universal feeling, whether well or ill founded, cannot be safely disregarded. We cannot make them equals. It does seem to me that systems of gradual emancipation might be adopted, but for their tardiness in this I will not undertake to judge our brethren of the South.

“When they remind us of their constitutional rights, I acknowledge them—not grudgingly, but fully and fairly; and I would give them any legislation for the reclaiming of their fugitives which should not in its stringency be more likely to carry a free man into slavery than our ordinary criminal laws are to hang an innocent one.

“But all this, to my judgment, furnishes no more excuse for permitting slavery to go into our own free territory than it would for reviving the African slave-trade by law. The law which forbids the bringing of slaves from Africa, and that which has so long forbidden the taking of them into Nebraska, can hardly be distinguished on any moral principle, and the repeal of the former could find quite as plausible excuses as that of the latter.”

## 12

### **'Admitting Opponent's Argument**

Granting that the Allies did borrow money from us with the intention of paying the loans, and that we loaned money to them in good faith; grant-

ing that they could pay us eventually, and that [England has already made arrangements for the payment of her share which is about forty per cent of the Allied war debt; granting all this it does not answer the question as to whether we should take the money from the Allies which they agreed to pay us.

The United States did not receive valuable concessions because of her activities in the war, our delegates did not go to the peace table with enormous demands, we gained nothing by the war that was not common with all the nations of the world. Granting this, we still lack evidence to prove that we should exact payment from those who owe us money. The United States has never repudiated a debt, but that does not imply that we should become a Shylock and demand our "pound of flesh" simply because that was the agreement when the loan was contracted.

Did not the Allies use the money to prosecute the war until we could get into it? It was their war we will grant until we declared war on Germany. Granting that this is unquestionably true and that we should not have declared war any sooner than we did, nevertheless as soon as that declaration was made the conflict was ours to prosecute to the best of our ability. We were unprepared. We could marshal money quickly, which was done, but it was many weary months

that the Allies hung on waiting for American men in sufficient numbers to have weight on the western front. They were fighting for us as soon as the declaration of war against Germany was made, they were fighting our battle and how well they fought is shown by the fact that they did hang on in spite of reverses until the American lads could get into fighting trim and turn the tide. They held on and it was our money that enabled them to do so. It was our money that gave them the power to fight our battle. We could not send our men at first so we sent our money, which the Allies agreed to pay since, naturally, they were vitally interested in the outcome of the war.

The money which was loaned to them, what was done with it? Was it taken out of our country? No, it was spent here for supplies, for food and munitions of war, it was spent here, paying American industry and the American producer high prices for what he had to sell. The money was spent here and did much to make our nation prosperous. Every month of the war added wealth to this nation, while it impoverished Europe. Admitting that it was the good fortune of the United States to be so favorably situated as to be able to furnish war supplies, and granting that it was a fortunate thing for our Allies that we were able to furnish them with what they needed, nevertheless everything that went into the conflict was for our



benefit as well as the general benefit of the nations with whom we were associated. The war left the United States better off economically than had been anticipated, and it left the European nations in worse financial straits than was expected at the time the loans were made. These things must be recognized. Of course the Allies promised to pay and expected to pay, England has made arrangements for payment, and doubtless we could collect most of the debt at least in time, but should we do it? Not what we can do, but what we ought to do, that should govern our actions. As Edmund Burke said in 1775 in reference to the American colonies, "The question with me is not whether you have a right to render your people miserable, but whether it is not your interest to make them happy. It is not what a lawyer tells me I may do, but what humanity, reason, and justice tell me I ought to do."

### 13

#### **Deductive Argument**

The affirmative in upholding the proposition that the federal government should pay a bonus to the ex-soldiers of the World War calls your attention to the general policy of our government concerning bonus grants. This would not be a violation of past precedent, in fact the precedent would be violated if the government failed to pay. A general policy has been established that

goes back to the days of the Revolution and has been maintained since with the exception of the Spanish-American war. Should the one exception or the general law prevail in this case? Manifestly it would be unreasonable to be governed by the exception, especially since that exception did not demand the sacrifice that was made by the soldiers during the World War.

The policy established by the United States during the Revolution and maintained through many decades should continue to be the active policy. Grants of land were given to all soldiers and officers who took part in the Revolutionary conflict. The privates and non-commissioned officers each received one hundred acres, ensigns one hundred fifty acres, lieutenants two hundred acres, captains three hundred, majors four hundred, lieutenant-colonels four hundred fifty and colonels five hundred, with larger grants to higher officers. An additional bonus of one hundred dollars was paid to all who enlisted prior to January 23, 1779, while officers continuing in service until the end of the war were given seven years half pay. That at a time when the economic conditions of the country did not warrant excessive expenses. It was recognized that this extra allowance was due the soldiers who gave of their time and risked much for the common good, and that recognition governed governmental action decades later.

The soldiers of the War of 1812 were given a cash bonus and one hundred sixty acres of land, those who enlisted in the later part of the war received three hundred twenty acres of land. Men who served through the Mexican War were given a bonus of one hundred sixty acres of land and had the option of taking one hundred dollars if they preferred. Civil War soldiers were given one hundred sixty acres of land and a cash bonus ranging from one hundred fifty to four hundred dollars, amounting in all to slightly more than four hundred five million dollars. Twenty-two states and the District of Columbia also paid the soldiers of the Civil War a cash bonus amounting to two hundred eighty-six million dollars. The soldiers of the World War in asking for a bonus were not asking the government to establish a new precedent, they were only asking the government to continue its established policy of granting awards to those who served the Commonwealth faithfully and well.

## 14

### **Begging the Question**

The soldiers of the World War had a great experience, it was an experience they can never forget, they saw much of the world at the expense of the government, men who had never had the privilege of traveling were taken to places in the

world that they had never expected to be able to see. The experience was valuable, and to have traveled at their own expense instead of the expense of the government would have cost them many hundreds of dollars. Should the ex-soldiers not remember all this in making their demands for adjusted compensation?

### **A n s w e r**

The negative is begging the question by saying that the soldiers got much valuable experience in their service. Of course they will never forget the experience as much as they would like to do so. Who would face the cannon's mouth, the machine guns, or endure the torture of poison gas for the sake of experience? Away with such an idea. Yes, the soldier got experience, experience he cannot speak of without a shudder. He saw much. He heard the groans of dying men, he heard the moans of the wounded, he saw human beings torn and bleeding, he saw pals dropping by his side never to rise again, he heard the shriek of hissing bullets and the boom of bursting shells, he saw cities laid waste, he saw the awfulness of war's destruction, and can you call that recompense? Surely not in this twentieth century of civilization and high ideals.

Those who died are heroes, honored by the nation. The country would do anything for them.

study of this grain the world famous Indian corn is the result, a grain that the world depends on very much for its food and its prosperity. Corn has become the great crop of the Middle West, being grown much more extensively than any other grain, and it is a vastly different grain than that grown by the Indians. In recent years it has been developed so that much larger ears are grown, while there are almost endless varieties.

A Professor of a Middle West agricultural college recently gave the world a new clover, Huban clover, evolved from other clovers that had long existed. New varieties of oats and wheat and other grains are brought out from time to time, evolved from other varieties, making possible the production of larger crops. New fruits are given to the world almost every year, that is, new varieties of fruit that have long been grown. The every bearing strawberry evolved from the common kind. Dwarf apples have been developed in recent years, dwarf trees that bear good sized fruits within two or three years. Earlier varieties of fruit are now grown extensively. Earlier vegetables have been developed to meet the demands of the public and add to the profits of the market gardener. This is evolution so common that we overlook it in our every day existence.

Turning to the animal kingdom we find that changes are as common as with plant life. The

domestic animals of today have been changed greatly from those that existed a century ago or even two or three decades ago. Take dairy cows for example. A cow that would produce eight or ten quarts of milk per day was once thought an excellent cow, now such an animal is inferior because the milking qualities of cows have been developed until twenty and thirty quarts per day is not unusual. The beef type of cattle are a vast improvement over the lanky, long horned type raised by the hundreds of thousands on the western plains not so very long ago. Some years ago in the highlands of Scotland, among the wild herds of native cattle, some pure black cattle were discovered without horns. Both the color and the absence of horns was striking, for the native cattle had enormously long horns. These black, hornless cattle were separated from others and a systematic effort made to preserve that which nature had given without the agency of man exercising any domination whatever. These separated cattle formed the foundation of what is now known as the Aberdeen Angus breed, popular with beef producers in many countries today. A century ago this breed was unknown, now it is numbered by the millions, evolved from the primitive cattle of the Scotland highlands.

Man shows marks of development from a more primitive race. There are primitive peoples

in existence today which we recognize as being typical of what man in general must have been ages ago. Skulls have been discovered in different parts of the world, showing that even more primitive races of human beings existed at one time than the most primitive types of the present. No skulls are discovered in the geological deposits of earlier ages which reveal as high type of intelligence as the average human being has today, but many evidences are to be found of the existence of a lower type. The low foreheads and large jaws have given place to jaws of moderate size and high foreheads.

We can see evolution around us in the plant and animal kingdom, we have evidences that man has changed materially from what he was at one time. With these specific instances which are known we may infer beyond any reasonable doubt that evolution is a general law of nature, for what nature has done in detail it is evident has been done in the mass, especially when all details examined show marks of the same process.

## 16

### Cause and Effect

Since adopting the new tariff schedule on sugar the price has advanced materially. Refined sugar now pays a tariff of \$2.20 per hundred pounds, while raw Cuban sugar pays \$1.76 per hundred pounds. With the advance in price it is

evident that the American housewife is having this duty added to the price formerly paid together with enough more to maintain a good percentage of profit to the refiner on his larger investment. The tariff is a heavy tax on American householders and for this reason we maintain that the duty on sugar should be removed.

### **Fallacy of Above Argument Shown**

Is the duty on sugar responsible for the prevailing high price? The affirmative contends that it is and advocates the repeal of the duty for that reason. But is the reasoning of the affirmative sound? Do not other factors enter into the determining of the price. Refined sugar pays a duty of \$2.20 per hundred pounds, which is just 52 cents per hundred pounds more than the Payne-Aldrich schedule and 95 cents per hundred pounds above the Underwood schedule. Cuban raw sugar pays a duty of \$1.76 per hundred pounds, which is just 41 cents more than the duty under the Payne-Aldrich schedule and 76 cents per hundred pounds more than the Underwood tariff. It is the increase in duty and not the total duty that must be taken into consideration.

Furthermore, other factors enter into the cost of sugar today. The duty may have a slight influence on price, but is not responsible for more than a fraction of the increased cost. We must recognize the law of supply and demand. The



demand for sugar has been good and the supply has been in excess of needs, consequently a low price has prevailed. While the supply is still sufficient to meet all actual requirements, the condition, of crops and the visible supply indicates that during the next year there will not be more than a very small surplus. A large surplus of anything always reduces the price, while a small surplus causes the price to increase, and when the surplus is entirely gone the price mounts skyward. This applies to everything that is needed by human beings, foodstuffs of all kinds, textiles, etc.

As soon as it was discovered that during the next year the sugar surplus would be slight if it should not be consumed entirely the price advanced. This was only to be expected. The price of wheat dropped when it was learned that in all probability the crop would be large, a report of crop destruction caused by the ravages of insects over a large area sends the price of grain up. The law of supply and demand is working constantly and has had much to do with the price of sugar at the present time. The refiners are not getting the full amount of the increase. They are bidding higher for Cuban raw sugar. The Cuban grower is getting a higher price per hundred pounds for his product. The visible and probable near future supply rather than the tariff is responsible for the advance in price.

In 1920 sugar advanced in price until it was selling above thirty cents per pound, the next year it was selling for less than ten cents. The same tariff schedule prevailed both years. The tariff had nothing whatever to do with the difference in price. Since the present tariff schedule is slightly higher than the schedule which it superseded it has possibly had a slight influence on the price, but it is not solely responsible for the increase in price as the affirmative would have you believe, and should the old schedule once more be put into effect the price could not be reduced to what it had been before since other factors enter into this matter. The Cuban grower is getting practically the same price for his raw sugar at home that the refiner had been getting for the refined sugar in this country. Until the supply is greater than it is at present there can be no hopes of a material reduction in the price of sugar. The affirmative has fallen into error in concluding that the tariff has caused the advance in price since other factors aside from the tariff enter into the proposition.

## 17

### Turning the Tables

During the debate in Parliament concerning the taxation of the American colonies, Lord Chatham delivered a speech on the subject which was replied to by others. One of the speakers opposing

Chatham asked the question, "When were the colonies emancipated?" Chatham in his response said, "The gentleman asks, 'When were the colonies emancipated?' I desire to know, when were they made slaves?"

This is one way of turning tables, but the most usual method is that of accepting the statement of the opponent and showing that instead of proving his contention it has the opposite effect.

## CHAPTER VII

### ARGUMENTS FOR SPECIAL STUDY

The following arguments have been included for special study. What kind of argument is represented? Is the reasoning sound? If not wherein does the speaker fall into error?

#### 18

#### **Chatham on Colonial Taxation**

"It is my opinion, that this kingdom has no right to lay a tax upon the colonies. At the same time, I assert the authority of this kingdom over the colonies to be sovereign and supreme in every circumstance of government and legislation whatsoever. They are the subjects of this kingdom; equally entitled with yourselves to all the natural rights of mankind and the peculiar privileges of Englishmen; equally bound by its laws, and equally participating in the constitution of this free country. The Americans are the sons not the bastards of England! Taxation is no part of the governing or legislative power. The taxes are a voluntary gift and grant of the Commons alone. In legislation the three estates of the realm are alike concerned; but the concurrence of the peers and the Crown to a tax is only necessary to clothe it with the form of a law. The gift and the grant

[191]

is of the Commons alone. In ancient days, the Crown, the barons, and the clergy possessed the lands. In those days the barons and the clergy gave and granted to the Crown. They gave and granted what was their own! At present, since the discovery of America, and other circumstances permitting, the Commons are become the proprietors of the land. The church (God bless it!) has but a pittance. The property of the lords, compared with that of the Commons, is as a drop of water in the ocean; and this House represents those Commons, the proprietors of the lands; and those proprietors virtually represent the rest of the inhabitants. When, therefore, in this House, we give and grant, we give and grant what is our own. But in an American tax, what do we do? 'We, your Majesty's Commons for Great Britain, give and grant to your Majesty'—what? Our own property? No! 'We give and grant to your Majesty' the property of your Majesty's Commons in America! It is an absurdity in terms."

## 19

### **James Otis on the Writs of Assistance**

"In the first place, may it please your Honors, I will admit that writs of one kind may be legal; that is, special writs, directed to special officers, and to search certain houses, etc., specially set forth in the writ, may be granted by the Court of Exchequer at home, upon oath made before the

Lord Treasurer by the person who asks it, that he suspects such goods to be concealed in those very places he desires to search. The act of 14 Charles II. which Mr. Gridley mentions, proves this. And in this light the writ appears like a warrant from a Justice of the Peace to search for stolen goods. Your Honors will find in the old books concerning the office of a Justice of the Peace, precedents of general warrants to search suspected houses. But in more modern books you will find only special warrants to search such and such houses specially named, in which the complainant has before sworn that he suspects his goods are concealed; and you will find it adjudged that special warrants only are legal. In the same manner I rely on it, that the writ prayed for in this petition, being general, is illegal. It is a power that places the liberty of every man in the hands of every petty officer. I say I admit that special writs of assistance, to search special places, may be granted to certain persons on oath; but I deny that the writ now prayed for can be granted, for I beg leave to make some observations on the writ itself, before I proceed to other acts of parliament. In the first place the writ is universal, being directed 'to all and singular Justices, Sheriffs, Constables, and all other officers and subjects;' so, that, in short, it is directed to every subject in the King's domains. Every one with this writ may be a tyrant; if this

commission be legal, a tyrant in a legal manner also may control, imprison, or murder anyone within the realm. In the next place it is perpetual; there is no return. A man is accountable to no person for his doings. Every man may reign secure in his petty tyranny, and spread terror and desolation around him. In the third place a person with this writ, in the daytime, may enter all houses, shops, etc., at will, and command all to assist him. Fourthly, by this writ, not only deputies, etc., but even their menial servants, are allowed to lord it over us. Now one of the most essential branches of English liberty is the freedom of one's house. A man's house is his castle; and whilst he is quiet, he is as well guarded as a prince in his castle. This writ, if it should be declared legal, would totally annihilate this privilege. Custom-house officers may enter our houses, when they please; we are commanded to permit their entry. Their menial servants may enter, may break locks, bars, and everything in their way; and whether they break through malice or revenge, no man, no court, can inquire."

## 20

### Portion of Monroe Doctrine

"It was stated at the commencement of the last session, that a great effort was then making in Spain and Portugal, to improve the condition of the people of those countries, and that it appeared

to be conducted with extraordinary moderation. It need scarcely be remarked that the result has been, so far, very different from what was then anticipated. Of events in that quarter of the globe, with which we have so much intercourse and from which we derive our origin, we have always been anxious and interested spectators. The citizens of the United States cherish sentiments the most friendly in favor of the liberty and happiness of their fellow-men on that side of the Atlantic. In the wars of the European powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced, that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere we are of necessity more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the Allied powers (The Holy Alliance) is essentially different in this respect from that of America. And to the defence of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole nation is devoted. We owe it, therefore, to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to de-



clare, that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence, and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

## 21

Case of Smyth vs. Ames. United States Supreme Court, 1898, 169 U. S. report, 466-550.

"A corporation maintaining a public highway, although it owns the property it employs for accomplishing public objects, must be held to have accepted its rights, privileges and franchises subject to the condition that the government creating it, or the government within whose limits it conducts its business, may by legislation protect the people against unreasonable charges for the services rendered by it. It can not be assumed that any railroad corporation, accepting franchises, rights and privileges at the hands of the public,

ever supposed that it acquired, or that it was intended to grant to it, the power to construct and maintain a public highway simply for its benefit, without regard to the rights of the public. But it is equally true that the corporation performing such public services and the people financially interested in its business and affairs have rights that may not be invaded by legislative enactment in disregard of the fundamental guarantees for the protection of property."

## 22

The following argument was quite popular with public speakers a few years ago. How does this argument in favor of prohibition compare with the experiences of the nation since the eighteenth amendment was added to the Constitution? Have unforeseen factors entered into the situation? Was the reasoning sound? Has time proven it to be logical? If not, why not?

When money is no longer spent for liquor it is spent for food, clothing, and other articles of value. Here is a crowd of men. They have formerly spent their money in the saloon but the saloons have been closed. Saturday night they get their pay checks and instead of marching to the saloon they go to the butcher shop. The butcher sees them coming and he remembers that they have always bought cheap meats so he orders his helper to bring out the cheap cuts, but John, the

boozer, now on the water wagon, says, "Give me some round steak." The butcher is surprised but cuts off the steak. Bill says, "we're tired eating chuck, give me some steak." Tom wants steak, Jim wants steak and so on down the line, and a hundred men who have never been in the butcher shop before are there ordering meats of various kinds. The butcher runs out of meat and telephones to the packer, "Send more meat." Other butchers and meat sellers want more meat, they are telephoning and telegraphing and the packer sees his stock diminishing rapidly. He orders his buyers to bid up on the next lot of cattle, other packers are in the same game and soon the stockman finds a greater demand for his stock. A whole state or several states have joined the prohibition ranks, the men are not spending money for booze, consequently have more money to spend for food and the meat producer is benefitted as well as everyone along the line from the producer to the consumer.

John and Jim and Tom and Bill and their crowd go to the baker's and buy bread, bread, bread. The baker must have more flour. He calls the dealer, "send me more flour." The dealer must get more flour from the miller, and as many dealers are calling on the miller at the same time he must call on the producer. There is likewise an urgent demand for wheat, and for all cereals

which are used in the production of food for the hungry families now being fed with the money that was formerly spent for drink.

When our friends on the water wagon get home that night they surprise their families with the many purchases, and then the wives are still more surprised to receive the balance of the pay check and told to buy clothes for themselves and the children. "There will be more next week," the husband adds.

Monday morning the dry goods and clothing stores are full of shoppers and the program of Saturday night is repeated until the arm of industry reaches clear back to the cotton fields of the South and the wool producing sections of the West. Every line of industry is busy, everything fairly hums, men have more work to do, there is demand for raw products at better prices, the farmers produce more, the railroads have more freight to haul, and everywhere there is more prosperity for people are spending money for necessities and those things which are useful. This throws more money into the channels of legitimate trade, everyone has more money to spend, except the saloon keeper and those interested in his business, but he has had his inning at the expense of the public long enough, it is the public's turn now, and the extension of prohibition gives the public their legitimate rights.

**23**

Labor should be an ardent supporter of prohibition in the interests of its own general prosperity. For every dollar spent for alcoholic drinks a smaller percentage goes for labor than in any other industry. It would be a calamity for labor to have beer and light wines legalized, for every dollar spent for the product of some other industry gives more to labor than labor ever receives from alcoholic liquors of any kind.

**24****On Woman Suffrage**

The votes of women aid reform. Wyoming was the first state to adopt woman suffrage. That was in 1869. Since that time Wyoming has passed from the blood and thunder type to a progressive, peaceful, law abiding state, where the amount of crime is small considering the great scope of open territory and the types of people with which the law abiding folk have to deal. While elections were being declared fraudulent in other states there is not a case on record of any disorder at the polls in all the history of woman's suffrage in Wyoming.

When Seattle, Washington, was boss ridden it took the votes of the women to free the city of corruption. The votes of the women settled the issue. If men alone had voted the reform would

have been defeated, but with the votes of the women corruption was forced to stand aside.

Woman suffrage and reform go hand in hand. The women can not do it all in a day or a year, but reforms begin immediately when women place votes in the ballot box. Some have pointed to victories of the vice crowd and the grafters immediately following the extension of woman suffrage, but we can not expect women to accomplish immediately what men failed to accomplish in decades of time. It is preposterous to argue against woman suffrage because evils still exist in the country. It takes time to accomplish anything, but the record of what women have accomplished is one that shows the value which the country derived by giving them the ballot.

Woman has always had wholesome ideals. Not that such ideals have never been upheld by men, but the ideals of a large group of women have been and are higher than the ideals of a similar group of men. Men are more inclined to think that some little indulgence that is not just right does not matter, while the average woman lives her life on a somewhat higher level. It is a well known fact that women are less tolerant toward each other than are men, while an offense of man that may be overlooked by society when committed by a woman is apt to lead to ostracism. The double standard in social life is evidence of the difference

in the attitude of society toward men and women. This double standard has been the outgrowth of higher idealism on the part of women. They have lived on a higher level, and thought higher than men. Those institutions that promote higher idealism, such as the church, have always been better supported by women than men, which is evidence of their high ideals.

Exercising the privilege of voting has enabled woman to make her ideals felt in politics. Women have determined to break down the double standard, not lowering the standard for themselves but lifting the standard of men to the same level as that expected of women. They have demanded of candidates a high motive. They are not satisfied with candidates who want office merely for the sake of having the office. That is not sufficient in the estimation of the new class of voters. Women regard office as an opportunity to render distinct public service and have no sympathy with a system that has put men into office and kept them there as a sort of charitable matter in some instances, and because men have not had backbone enough to break down the system in other instances.

Women are intolerant of political corruption. They have no sympathy with those who want to go slow in bringing about desired changes. As they hate dirt in the home to the annoyance of the male element of the household so do they hate

political dirt or corruption in public affairs to the annoyance of those who profit by such corruption or who do not want to bestir themselves to get public affairs cleaned up.

## 25

Capital punishment should be abolished. It is the remains of barbarism, an ancient mode of punishing criminals or supposed criminals which has come down to the present time as a relic of barbarian days. Civilization has advanced away from this form of punishment to a very large extent and it should be abolished entirely. In England, at one time, there were more than one hundred offenses punishable by death. Gradually that number was reduced to two. In our own nation many states have abolished this barbarous custom for the sentiment of society is against the sanctioning of any form of punishment so inhuman.

Capital punishment should be abolished; first, because we should not take the life of any person; second, it is not real punishment—it is revenge; third, it does not accomplish the real aim of punishment.

Life itself is from God, and should not be taken by men. When civilization first began to show itself through the turmoil of barbarism it brought with it the custom of taking life for life for certain offenses, but since that time civilization



has made marked advances, and humanity is supposed to have a higher standard. Christ has come into the world with His message of love for all humanity, peace and good will toward men, and as civilized beings we should cease to hold a barbarous custom, since we claim to have accepted the teachings of the Christ who revealed the sacredness of human life.

Capital punishment is not real punishment. Society is outraged because of some offense committed. Someone is arrested for the offense, tried and declared guilty and outraged society demands the life of the offender, sinking for the moment to the level of the savage who insists on getting his revenge.

Capital punishment does not accomplish the real aim of punishment, or at least accomplish what the aim of punishment should be; to help the criminal and to raise the standard of society by wholesome influences that lead away from crime. The criminal is convicted, the judge has passed the sentence of death, and the prisoner is considered by well meaning folk as an object on which they may exert their influence for the purpose of saving his soul. What kind of a heart could a man have within him who would receive with joy the ministrations of the clergy while deprived of liberty and knowing that soon he must give up life also to satisfy the cravings of the law? It is

true that many prisoners accept the services of priest or minister, but what criminal having led a life of wrong doing can learn in so short a time the true significance of forgiveness and repentance? It is more reasonable to conclude that the prisoner seeks to escape, what to him is more persecution, by making a show of acceptance of faith, when in reality his heart is still rebellious.

It would be vastly better for the prisoner if in place of the sentence of death the judge would read the sentence, "Imprisonment for Life." Then the innocent prisoner would have an opportunity to prove his innocence, and with proper treatment, and years of time, the one who is guilty may possibly learn that the hand of man is not against him because of hatred, but with the desire to make of him a better man, that society might be safer. Hundreds of criminals, serving a life sentence, have, during their long imprisonment, been brought to a realization of the magnitude of their crimes, and have truly repented of their misspent life, who, had capital punishment been inflicted, would have faced the hereafter bound with sin. Dare we force a man before the bar of eternal justice at a time when he will be lost forever?

Punishment of the criminal is also for the benefit of others, and the means of punishment should be adopted that has the greatest tendency to lead away from crime. Many men, criminals at

heart, refrain from committing a crime from fear of punishment. If the punishment is swift, the fear becomes less, but if the punishment is long drawn out hesitancy will many times bring a change of attitude and the crime is not committed. Life imprisonment is consequently better for those outside prison walls as well as for those convicted of crime.

The affirmative has shown you that punishment is a relic of barbarism, that we do not have the right to take the life of any person, that capital punishment is revenge rather than real punishment, and that this form of punishment is not best for either the criminal or society, and with this evidence the affirmative concludes that, beyond a reasonable doubt, capital punishment should be abolished.

## 26

*Resolved:—That Training Has a Larger Influence on a Child's Life Than Heredity.*

The question for our discussion is one that has long attracted the attention of educators, psychologists, and others interested in the welfare of humanity. Heredity and training are the two big factors in character development, but the evidences available indicate that of the two training has by far the larger influence. Sometimes one is inclined to believe that heredity is the all important factor, confusing heredity with nature,

Nature is the existing system of things, heredity is the law by which living beings tend to repeat their characteristics in their descendants. Heredity is then one phase of nature; training is another phase for the law of training is as natural as the law of heredity, whether applied to plants or to human beings. Through training Burbank has been able to develop new plants.

There are four main reasons why training has a larger influence on the child's life than heredity; first, training changes the influence of heredity; second, the natural tendency is to grow in accordance with training; third, training has an unconscious influence; fourth, tendencies are fixed by repetition.

The human race has developed in the course of its thousands of years existence, but it did not develop through heredity, it developed in spite of heredity. Heredity would have kept the human race the same generation after generation, but an element of training entered into human life and each generation became a little different from the one before. As training became more prominent the changes from generation to generation were more marked, until within recent years progress has been very rapid for training has been emphasized as never before.

A child from a good family if placed in surroundings where he receives evil training becomes

evil. There are exceptions, but this is the general rule. A child whose ancestry is not the best when given the right kind of training becomes a good citizen in nearly every instance, and the exceptions can almost always be traced to the fact that improper training entered into the case in one way or another.

The regeneration of the slum districts in the cities comes with a change in environment and in the training received by the younger generation. When families are broken up and children placed where they are trained differently they become distinctly different. Brothers and sisters who receive different training become so different that the relationship would not be suspected.

Heredity is the outgrowth of generations of training. When Burbank wanted to change a certain plant he gave it certain care, he trained the plant, and the next generation of plants was a little more like what he wanted than the first. Training modified the plant and its reproductive tendency so that eventually a different plant resulted.

Human beings are different in looks, actions, and abilities, and yet all had a common origin. It is now said that we inherit different qualities so that there must have been a change sometime in heredity. That change was brought about through training. Some were trained differently than others and eventually became so distinctly different that

the qualities which nationalities transmit by heredity vary.

The influence of training is demonstrated by backward communities and countries where there is lack of training or education. In these places the people remain practically the same generation after generation. The settlers in the mountain regions of North Carolina, Tennessee, and Kentucky came from the country farther east. Some of their people went farther north and west and after a time there was a vast difference in the two classes of people. Those who lived in the mountains had no educational opportunities and remained practically the same generation after generation, those who settled in the open country had educational opportunities, they became trained and made wonderful progress.

Second, the natural tendency is to grow in accordance with the training. A tree may be trained to grow into any shape, while through plant training Burbank has been able to develop entirely different species than the original parent stock. The lower animals show the effect of training, and human beings respond more readily to training than do either plants or animals. A child is the most sensitive of all living things and most ready to respond to influences.

Third, training has an unconscious influence. It is so gradual that one does not realize that the

life is being changed, and for that reason is often overlooked. By reason of the unconscious change people are often inclined to disregard the influence of training. When years pass by and the changes that have taken place are considered it is then seen that all the while this influence has been at work, day by day unconsciously molding character. The records of charitable societies show that eighty-five per cent. of the children of paupers and criminals who are placed in good homes at an early age become good citizens. Heredity holds fifteen per cent., training redeems eighty-five per cent., which is strong evidence in favor of training. When the child becomes a mature man or woman the effect of the training is demonstrated, and even though the modification has been so gradual that the ordinary observer has failed to note the change, yet it manifests itself in the end in a definite manner.

Fourth, tendencies are fixed by repetition. Heredity is only the result of all past training for training created the first tendency and all subsequent tendencies have been added to the first through the force of this same agency. By repetition a tendency becomes fixed and then becomes a force of heredity. Every hereditary tendency is the result of some past environment. As past environment and training modified ultimate inherited qualities, so is present training a stronger

factor in the child's life than heredity for heredity is past and the ever present is the all controlling factor. If our ancestors had not been trained we would not be different from the people who lived thousands of years ago. But our ancestors were trained and we are different because of that training.

Since training changes the influence of heredity and the natural tendency is to grow in accordance with training; since training has an unceasing unconscious influence as well as a conscious influence; and since tendencies of a hereditary nature are fixed by repetition through training, the affirmative believes that it has shown that training has a larger influence on a child's life than heredity.

## 27

*Intra-mural athletics should take the place of inter-collegiate athletic games, for inter-collegiate contests tend to develop only a few of the students while intra-mural systems develop a large percentage.*

Statistics of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, covering 143 colleges and universities engaged in inter-collegiate athletics, reveal the terrible fact that less than seventeen per cent. of the male students participate in the games, while less than half engage in any form of system-



atized exercise. Compare this with Reed College which has maintained a system of intra-mural athletics since the early period of its existence. In that institution about ninety-five per cent. of the men engage in athletic games at least once a week.

Inter-collegiate games arouse a college spirit, it must be acknowledged, but the legitimate function of athletics is not to arouse this spirit as many activities tend to indicate, but to give the individual physical development that will make him better fitted to meet the situations in life with which he may some time be confronted. Inter-collegiate athletic policies tend to develop a school spirit, intra-mural athletics emphasize the benefit which the individual is to receive.

When the United States entered the World War in 1917 the government issued a call for college students and graduates to enter officers' training camps. If there is any class of men who should be physically strong surely it should be the students of our colleges and universities, and those who have recently graduated. Thousands responded to the call of the government, but a distressingly large percentage were rejected because of physical unfitness. College athletics should have made these men fit for the task of defending their country in the time of need, but only the few had been trained. In Reed College the intra-mural system had been in operation seven years and every undergraduate,

with only one exception, who applied for admission to the army or navy passed the physical examinations. Reed College with its intra-mural system trained almost one hundred per cent. of its men through some physical activity and registered almost one hundred per cent. fitness for government war service.

## 28

*Congress should pass a soldier bonus bill to help remove the handicap which the soldiers suffered by reason of their months or years of service in the army.*

The soldiers gave up positions, occupations, professions, etc. They could not carry on their chosen vocations, they lost the progress they might have made in their special lines of work during the time they were in the army. They lost the difference between the wages they received and what they could have earned at home, and came back to changed conditions which were difficult for them to fit into. The soldiers suffered a financial loss, with some exceptions of course, and were handicapped by returning to a life more difficult than when they left and without the opportunity for adjusting themselves to it. This was a tremendous handicap manifested in a financial way, and since the handicap was to a large extent financial the bonus would help to remove it.

## 29

*The federal government should rigidly exclude all Japanese immigration from the United States.*

Rigid exclusion is practical. This seems to be the consensus of opinion among even those who have decided favorable leanings toward the Japanese. K. K. Kawakami, who is himself a Japanese and who has lived for a number of years in this country, says in an article on "California and the Japanese" published in *The Nation*, February 8, 1921, "Japan must agree to stop emigration of her subjects to America with these three exceptions: (a) Japanese who are lawfully here and who have established independent business, commercial or agricultural, should be allowed to send for wives whom they had married before they came to America, or to go to Japan and return here with wives within reasonable time; (b) Japanese lawfully admitted and having established business in this country should be allowed to send for children under a certain age whom they had left in Japan, and who depend upon their support; (c) Japanese lawfully admitted and establishing domicile in this country should be allowed to go and visit Japan with the privilege of returning." A Japanese resident of our country in making a plea for the Japanese advocates the exclusion of immigrants with these exceptions.

Why would rigid exclusion be practical? In the first place it would prevent any international entanglements. California sees the Japanese problem better than any other state in the Union, and California has considered it essential to her welfare to pass restrictive legislation. Since more than sixty per cent. of the Japanese who have come to this country in recent years have settled in California that state has felt that she is more concerned with this problem than other portions of the United States and has taken action accordingly. It is not necessary to dwell upon the attitude of Japan on the action taken by California. When the state legislature was about to pass the land law of 1913 which was aimed against the Japanese, W. J. Bryan, then Secretary of State, was sent by President Wilson across the continent to protest against the passing of the law because of the danger of international complications.

The restriction of immigration is recognized throughout the world as a matter to be handled by national governments and not by local governments within a nation. The federal government came to an agreement with Japan over the admission of immigrants, and then California stepped in, as she had a right to do, under the privilege of the states to pass legislation regarding the holding of lands, and so far as California is concerned set aside some provisions of the agreement between

our federal government and Japan. The Japanese ask whether the State or the Union is supreme. They think, many of them, though their leading statesmen know better, that our federal government should compel California or any other state to accept immigrants as per agreement. But our states will continue to exercise their individual rights to the exclusion of Japanese by such means as may be at their command.

The present condition means international friction, whereas if the federal government enacted legislation rigidly excluding Japanese immigration it would settle the matter definitely and eliminate the situation of the federal government saying one thing and the states acting another. If the Japanese are to be excluded they consider it less humiliating to be excluded by the action of the federal government rather than by action of a state that is only a part of the nation. K. K. Kawakami, previously quoted, who wishes above all things peace between his country and ours, says, that the "restrictive and discriminatory measure with regard to Japanese immigration should be couched in plain terms which permit of no misunderstanding."

### 30

*Race prejudice is responsible for much of the opposition to the Japanese in California.*

It is said that the Japanese are clannish, that they will not become Americanized or assimilated. The facts are that the Americans will not let them. One San Joaquin Valley rancher says, "The Japanese just wont neighbor. You might as well live alone in the middle of a desert as to live with Japanese around you. I wont let my children go to school with them, and I wont have anything to do with them if I can help it." Who was it that wouldn't neighbor?

It has been often stated that land depreciates in value as soon as a Japanese comes into the neighborhood. The reason is because Americans do not want to live around him rather than on account of the absence of desire of the Japanese to become Americanized. The rights of citizenship are denied to the Japanese immigrant. He can not become an American citizen no matter how long he may reside here. He can not vote even though he does interest himself in American politics. Of what benefit is it to him to learn American ideals if he must remain on the outside of our national activities? Why should he respond to Americanizing influence when there is an unsurmountable barrier to citizenship? This will account for the Japanese failing to become Americanized or assimilated. Evidences are that wherever the Japanese goes, if he is given an op-

portunity, he readily adapts himself to the ways of the people around him. He is adaptable and can be assimilated for he does not hold himself aloof if others give him a chance. It is America that has held aloof and compelled the Japanese to be ostracized.

Evidence taken by the Congressional Committee looking into the Japanese problem of the west is favorable to the immigrant from the island empire. Even men and women who wanted immigration rigidly restricted testified that the Japanese residents in this country are loyal, industrious, sober, frugal, thrifty, clean, orderly, law-abiding and peaceful. These are characteristics of the Japanese as admitted by witnesses before the Committee, witnesses who hoped to get Congress to entirely stop Japanese immigration to this country. What an array of virtues! What a wonderful country this would be if all of our residents had the same characteristics! The opponents of Japanese immigration maintain that they do not have any feelings of race prejudice, but their statements bear evidence that race prejudice alone actuates their opposition. If not prejudice then how can we account for the opposition by people who admit of so many Japanese virtues and still maintain that the Japanese are undesirable residents of the state?

## 31

*The Ku Klux Klan is antagonistic to the principles of the American government.*

Granted that the members of the Ku Klux Klan have the highest motives, that they are prompted by noble designs, that they are zealous for the welfare of the country, yet they have adopted a wrong method to accomplish their purposes, for their activities undermine the very principles on which our government rests.

It is essential to the welfare of democracy that we have stability along with other things, and we cannot maintain stability when groups of people organize for the purpose of making changes instantaneously. If this plan should prevail what would there be to prevent some other organization composed of people of the distinctly evil type from suddenly overthrowing the good that the klan has accomplished? We must have stability or our democracy is not safe. The klan defeats the element of stability in the government, substituting what is no more nor less than mob rule.

There was a time when government was in the hands of groups of people who did just what they thought was right or what they pleased to do at any time. The feudal days in England, Scotland, and other countries illustrate this very well. When one group thought that another had encroached on their rights or done things that they



should not have done the one group went out to fight against the other, and there was constant strife, turmoil. Each group was a power unto itself and maintained its authority as best it could by organized opposition to other groups. So long as this prevailed there could be no real government. Not until the feudal lords submitted to a single authority was it possible to create order out of chaos and establish national government. The United States established a national system of government in the first place and our system of government is opposed to any old time feudal idea of a group becoming an authority unto itself. The Ku Klux Klan is the revival of the feudal idea of a group of people attempting to right wrongs in such manner as they happen to believe should be done and to exercise authority over other groups of people whether good, bad, or indifferent, as they think expedient. As such it is opposed to stable government and antagonistic to the principles on which the American commonwealth rests.

### 32

*Education should be made a qualification for voting.*

One cannot vote properly without first having an adequate understanding of issues. Without an education it is impossible to comprehend the issues involved in our governmental affairs. Even the

best educated are puzzled at times, and how much more difficult is the problem for the uneducated! A vote is power. Power placed in the hands of one who knows how to use it properly is an excellent means of promoting public welfare; but power placed in the hands of one who does not know how to use it properly is a menace to the public good.

John Jay, the first Chief Justice of the United States, said, "I consider knowledge to be the soul of a Republic, and as the weak and wicked are generally in alliance, as much care should be taken to diminish the number of the former as of the latter. Education is the way to do this."

Since all people have not become educated and thereby overcome their weakness the only safeguard is to deprive them of the voting privilege that their weakness may not undermine the foundation of our republic. The republic rests upon the voters, therefore we should have strong voters and no uneducated person is a strong voter.

### 33

*The United States should continue its Monroe Doctrine policy.*

The Monroe Doctrine is a policy for the emergency. As long as we do not discontinue it we have it to fall back upon should an emergency arise. Why do we maintain a navy or keep a standing army? Why do we have policemen?

For the one purpose of having them should an emergency arise when they might be needed. No one knows what the future may bring forth. It is better to be safe than sorry.

The Monroe Doctrine is of value to the entire Western Hemisphere. Since the policy was announced not a foot of territory in the Western Hemisphere has been exploited by any foreign country. Exploitation was once attempted, but when the United States said stop it did stop. When the nations of Europe were turning their attention to all valuable sections of the world that offered hopes for conquest they looked to South America and parts of North America with longing eyes, but the Monroe Doctrine stood in their way. Millions of square miles of territory have been taken by European nations in the past century in other parts of the world, taken from people as well able to defend themselves as Latin America would have been. Portions of the Western Hemisphere might have been conquered just as easily as parts of the Eastern Hemisphere, and the prize would have been greater, but the nations desisted, and the only reason they staid out was because the United States upheld the Monroe Doctrine.

It may be said that a new international spirit prevails and that nations no longer have any designs against Latin American countries, for which reason the Monroe Doctrine should be abandoned

as a useless policy. If nations have no designs against Latin American countries the Monroe Doctrine does not interfere with their legitimate interests, it does not injure their future welfare, it is not a menace to their future designs. On the other hand there is no assurance that the new international spirit is such that the Latin American countries are safe, or that the integrity of the Western Hemisphere may not be violated. The Monroe Doctrine is a dormant policy when it is not needed, it is injuring no one; but so long as it is not abandoned by the United States it is ready to spring into life should the emergency arise.

### 34

*Should America cancel the allied debts for moral reasons? Negative argument.*

America does not have a moral obligation to cancel the debt. The war was not our war until we actually got into it, and after we got into it we certainly did our part. We were not prepared, and while we could have done effective work immediately in the way of sending soldiers to Europe if we had been prepared, the facts are that no nation in the history of the world ever rushed preparation as we did during 1917 and 1918. The nation gave itself to the one task of winning the war. Soldiers were raised by the millions. We not only furnished men just as fast

as they could be trained, the nation gave its money also. When the government called for money from the people they answered with billions of dollars. The United States government raised money faster than it has ever been raised before. Europe was amazed at what we could do in this respect as well as in our other activities.

Not only did America raise much money, but we spent it freely. In addition to the liberty loans enormous sums were raised by taxation. The nation was heavily taxed during the war. Money was raised on most everything that could be thought of that would give some revenue. The people paid their high taxes without a murmur, and all the money raised by taxation as well as billions raised by the sale of liberty bonds was actually spent in carrying on the war—spent without returns whatever except victory.

We did loan money to the allies, because they had gotten to the end of their financial rope and they had to have our money or be defeated. We saved them from becoming the slaves of Germany by the aid which we gave them. Have they forgotten that? We loaned money to the allies to prosecute the war, but the allies did not pay all the expenses by any means. We spent billions of dollars for the cause of the war. Our military expenses were over twenty-four billion dollars. The contributions for Red Cross and relief work

made by private individuals and the government combined amounted to over two billions more. In addition to that there was an expense of four and one-half billion dollars in extra cost of government functions. The war cost us, then, more than thirty billion dollars in addition to the money loaned to our allies. Does this appear that we were pikers loading the expense of the conflict on our heavily burdened allies? Does this appear that we did not do our share?

### 35

*Should Asiatic immigrants be admitted to the United States on the same terms as Europeans? Negative argument.*

Asiatics are a distinctly different people from the Europeans. Americans are the descendants of Europeans and for that reason have more in common with the people from these countries. There is a bond of relationship that is quite significant and which is lacking with the Asiatics. Americans and Europeans respond to the same stimuli while Americans and Asiatics do not. The Europeans are able to grasp the American viewpoint, they can appreciate the American ideals while Asiatics are so constituted that this is impossible with them. We may or may not believe that Asiatics are inferior to Europeans but we must acknowledge that they are different, that Americans are more

nearly like the Europeans than the Asiatics, that there is a better basis for a common understanding, and for this reason we should not place Europeans and Asiatics on the same level in reference to immigration.

## PART FOUR



### Debatable Propositions Classified





## CHAPTER VIII

### DEBATABLE PROPOSITIONS CLASSIFIED

The following list of classified propositions for debate has been prepared to furnish debaters with questions which warrant discussion from either affirmative or negative side. One may have decided opinions favoring one side or the other, but much may be said on either side. This list will suggest other propositions to the thoughtful student:

#### **Political**

1. Resolved: That the Commission Form of Government is Best for Municipalities.

2. The City Manager Plan of Municipal Government is Preferable to the Commission Plan.

3. The City of New York Should have Home Rule.

4. The Recall Should be Applied to All Elective Officers, when a Majority of the People Demand it.

5. Judicial Decisions Should be Subject to Recall.

6. The Optional Initiative and Referendum are Desirable.

7. The Initiative and Referendum have Promoted Better Government.

8. The Progress of Woman's Suffrage has Promoted the Economic and Social Welfare of the Nation.

9. We Should Maintain an Educational Qualification for Voting.

10. A Limited Property Qualification Would Improve American Suffrage.

11. The Term of the President Should be Extended to Six Years—the Privilege of a Second Term not Allowed.

12. The Short Ballot Should take the Place of the Prevailing Long Ballot.

13. A Smaller House of Representatives Would Promote Better Legislation.

14. Presidential Nominations Should be made through Direct Primary Elections.

15. Federal Primary Elections Should be Held for the Nomination of President.

16. Cabinet Officers Should be Elected by the People Rather than Being Appointed by the President.

17. Cabinet Members Should be made Members of the United States Senate.

18. Cabinet Members Should be Responsible to Congress for Their Actions Rather than Being Responsible to the President.

19. The Salary of Cabinet Officers Should be Increased to \$25,000 Annually.

20. The President Should have the Power to Remove Appointees from Office only with the Consent of the Senate or a Senate Committee when Congress is not in Session.

21. When Congress Passes a Bill Covering Distinctly Different Matters, Including Specific Appropriations, the President Should have the Power of Vetoing Portions of the Bill without Vetoing All.

22. Third Party Movements are Detrimental to the Welfare of the Country.

23. The Time of Election Should be Changed so that the President Assume the Duties of His Office within a Few Weeks After He is Elected.

24. The Long Period Between the Election of Members of Congress and the Time for Regular Session of Congress when Members Assume the Duties of Office is Detrimental to the Best Interest of the Public.

25. Voting the Party Ticket Irrespective of Candidates is Justifiable.

26. Southern States are Justified in Imposing Rigid Suffrage Restrictions.

27. The Restrictions Limiting the Negro Vote in the Various States is Beneficial to the Negro as it Encourages Him to Improve His Condition so that He may Enjoy Suffrage Privileges.

28. Party Politics should have no Place in Municipal Elections.

29. The Prohibition Law Should be Rigidly Enforced.

30. It would be a Good Thing for the Country for Congress to Take a Two Year Recess.

31. Congressional Blocs are Beneficial.

32. Congressional Blocs Protect the Vital Interests of the Public.

### **Immigration and Citizenship**

33. Chinese and Japanese Should have the Right to Become United States Citizens.

34. Naturalization Laws should be Modified to Eliminate Discrimination.

35. A Greater Effort Should be Made to Americanize the Immigrants.

36. Societies Should be Organized to Interest the Immigrants in Settling on Unoccupied Lands instead of Becoming Industrial Workers.

37. The United States Can Serve Humanity by Encouraging Immigration.

38. Immigration is Beneficial to America.

39. Orientals Should be Admitted as Immigrants on the Same Terms as Other People.

40. No Immigrants Should be Permitted to Remain in This Country more than One Year Without Declaring Their Intention of Becoming Citizens.

41. California is Justified in Her Attitude Concerning the Japanese.

42. Immigration Should be Stopped for a Number of Years in the Interests of Labor.

43. The Literacy Test for Immigrants has Proven to be an Impractical Test.

44. The American Indian Should be Admitted to Citizenship on the Same Basis as Other People.

### **International**

45. The Interests of Civilization Demand Disarmament rather than Armament.

46. The United States Should Retain Possessions in the Pacific to Aid in Maintaining Peace in that part of the World.

47. The Permanent Retaining of the Philippines would be Best for Both the United States and the Philippines.

48. The United States and Latin American Countries Should Unite on a Common Policy to take the place of the Monroe Doctrine.

49. The Peaceful Annexation of Mexico to the United States Would be Best for Both Countries.

50. Canada Should be made an Independent Commonwealth.

51. For Economic Reasons Canada Should be Annexed to the United States.

52. The Annexation of Canada to the United States Would Promote the General Welfare of Both Countries.

53. Reciprocity Between the United States and Canada Should be Developed to the Extent of the Elimination of All Tariff Duties on Everything Produced or Manufactured in the Respective Countries.

54. Japan Should be Given some Opportunity for Legitimate Expansion.

55. The United States Should Accept the Responsibility of Protecting Armenia.

56. Granted the Willingness of the People of Cuba that Country should be made a State of the United States.

57. The St. Lawrence River Canal Project Should be Carried out by the United States and Canada.

58. The United States Should Take an Active Part in Helping Europe Solve Her Economic Problems.

59. The French Were Justified in Occupying the Ruhr Valley.

60. The Turks Should be Driven out of Europe.

61. The Achievements of the League of Nations Have Justified Its Existence.

62. The Panama Canal Zone Should be made Neutral Territory.

63. The Philippine Islands should be Permanently given the same Privileges of Self Government as Canada Enjoys at Present.

64. The Situation in Haiti Warrants Permanent Control by the United States.

65. Self Government is Best for Haiti.

66. A Monarchy Form of Government Would be Better for Mexico than the Republic System of Government.

67. A Highly Civilized People is Justified in Exercising Authority over a People Unable to Judge What is Best for Themselves.

68. The United States and England Should Form a Friendly Alliance to Promote Peace and Good Will Throughout the World.

69. The Government Should Maintain a Censorship of Press Comment on International Affairs.

### **E d u c a t i o n a l**

70. Compulsory Education Laws Are Desirable.

71. Rural Schools Should be Consolidated.

72. Sectarian Schools Should Receive State Aid.

73. The Best Interests of the American Colleges Are Promoted by the Adoption of the Honor System.



74. Pupil Self Government Systems Should be Generally Adopted in the American Public Schools.

75. Free Text Books Should be Provided in the Public Schools.

76. Vocational Education Should be Further Extended.

77. Industrial Education is Best for the Negro Race.

78. Secondary Schools Should Provide for Electives for the Majority of the Studies.

79. There Should be more Correlating of Subjects Taught in the Public Schools.

80. Academic and Industrial Training Should be Correlated in the Secondary Schools.

81. Intra-mural Athletics Should Displace Inter-collegiate Athletic Contests.

82. Inter-collegiate Football Develops a Commendable College Spirit.

83. The Unit of Taxation and Administration of School Affairs Should be Extended.

84. The State Should be made the Unit of Taxation for School Purposes.

85. The County Should be made the Unit of School Administration, Except that Cities of 25,000 Inhabitants Maintain Their Own Separate Organizations.

86. Simplified Spelling Should be Adopted in the Public Schools of America.

87. Secret School Fraternities Should be Abolished.

88. Compulsory Education Laws Should Adopt Sixteen as the Minimum Age when Children may Leave School.

89. Sectarian Elementary Schools Should be Under the same Supervision as Public Schools.

90. Sectarian Elementary Schools Should Maintain Minimum Standards Equal to those of the Public Schools.

91. The 6-3-3 Plan for Elementary Grades and High School Should be Universally Adopted.

92. Informal Gymnastics Should Displace Formal Gymnastics in Physical Training Departments of High Schools and Colleges.

93. All Languages other than English Should be Abolished from the Elementary Schools of the United States, below the Junior High School.

94. Private Schools Should be Forbidden to use a Foreign Language as a Language for General Instruction.

95. Corporal Punishment is Justifiable.

96. The Federal Government Should Control the Educational Policies of the Nation.

97. The Public Schools Should be Nationalized.

98. A Uniform Program of Citizenship Training Should be used in the American Elementary Schools.

99. Parents are Better Qualified to Instruct Their Children in the Subject of Sex Hygiene than Public School Teachers.

100. Sex Hygiene Should be Taught in the Public Schools.

101. Thrift Teaching Should be made Compulsory in All Schools.

102. City Superintendents Should be Elected for Terms of Three Years.

103. States Should Provide for Rural School Supervisors in Addition to the County Superintendents, no Supervisor to have Supervision over more than Twenty-five Schools.

104. County, District, or Division Superintendents of Schools Should be Elected by a Board made up of the Presidents of the Various Boards of Education of the County, Division, or District.

105. State Superintendents of Public Instruction Should be Selected by the State Boards of Education.

106. Election of School Officials aside from School Director, by the Vote of the People is Detrimental to Educational Interests.

107. The Reading of the Bible without any Attempt at Denominational Interpretation Should be Encouraged in All Public Schools.

108. The Offering of Prizes in Public Schools is Commendatory.

109. Military Drill Should be made Compulsory in All High Schools.

110. Private High Schools Should be Abolished.

111. All Public Schools Should Establish School Savings Banks.

112. The School Curriculum Should be Revised to Prevent any Break from the Elementary School until Graduation from College.

### **Social**

113. Uniform Marriage and Divorce Laws Should be Secured in the Respective States.

114. There is a Close Relationship between Household Arts and Social Development.

115. Aged Citizens, Unable to Support Themselves, Should be Pensioned by the State.

116. Compulsory Old Age Insurance Would Promote Better Social Conditions.

117. The Tendency of Cities to Advertise Themselves is Detrimental in Attracting People from the Country to the City.

118. The Boy Scout Movement Should be Promoted in All Communities.

119. Camp Fire Girl Activities Promote Better Social Conditions.

120. Sunday Blue Laws Should be Enacted and Enforced in the Various States.

121. The Economic Independence of Women is Beneficial to Society.

122. The Principle of the British National Health Insurance Act of May 20, 1920, Should be Adopted by the United States.

123. State Compensation Insurance in California Has Justified the Extension of the Plan to Other States.

124. A Co-operative Consumers' Movement Would be Beneficial to the People of the United States.

125. The National Guilds Movement in Great Britain Should be Adopted by the United States.

126. Americanization is as Essential for the Native Born as for the Foreign Born.

127. Woman Suffrage has Improved Social Conditions.

128. The Modern Flapper is Distinctly a Product of the Age in which She Lives.

129. The Larger Freedom of Women in Recent Years Has been Socially Beneficial.

130. A Shifting of Population from the East to the Middle West Would be Socially Beneficial to the Nation.

### **L a b o r**

131. Through Appropriate Legislation a Minimum Wage Scale Should be put in Operation throughout the United States.

132. Labor Unions Are a Detriment to the People of the United States.

133. Strikes Are Justifiable.

134. Capital and Labor Should be Compelled to Settle Their Disputes in Legally Established Courts of Arbitration.

135. More Stringent Child Labor Laws Should be Passed.

136. The Federal Government Should Adopt the Principles of the Kansas Industrial Law.

137. Convict Labor Systems Should be Abolished.

138. Federal Injunctions in Labor Disputes Should be made Illegal by Action of Congress.

139. The Federal Constitution Should be Amended to give the Federal Government full Control of Child Labor Legislation.

140. Employers Should Adopt Profit Sharing Policies for the Benefit of Their Employees.

141. The Closed Shop is Antagonistic to the Best Interests of the American People.

142. Labor Has a Right to Organize.

143. The Economic Waste of Strikes more than Offsets any Benefits Derived by Labor.

144. The Open Shop and the Employer-Employee Council is Preferable to the Closed Shop.

145. Employers Should Recognize the Collective Bargaining Rights of Employees.

146. The Federal Government Should Pass Legislation to Restrain Strikes and Lockouts until

an Investigation can be made by the Government and Its Findings made Public, Allowing not more than Ninety Days for such Investigations.

147. Ford's Industrial System Would be Practical for All Large Industries.

148. Employment Management of Large Industries Promotes the Best Interests of the Workmen.

149. Co-Partnership Would Solve America's Industrial and Labor Problems.

150. Profit Sharing is Just from the Standpoint of the Employee and Expedient from the Standpoint of the Employer.

151. The Railway Labor Board Should be given Absolute Power to Enforce Its Decisions.

152. The Eight Hour Day Should be made the Standard in All Industries.

153. The Hours of Employment in the United States Steel Industry are Detrimental to Society.

### **Economic**

154. The United States Government Should Control All Public Utilities.

155. The United States Government Should Own All Telephone and Telegraph Systems in the Nation.

156. The Government Should Maintain a Telegraph System in Connection with the Post Office Department.

157. The National Government Should Control All Natural Resources, Excepting Agricultural Resources.

158. Municipal Ownership of Utilities is Preferable to Private Ownership.

159. An Amendment Should be passed Permitting Congress to Levy a Tax on All Taxable Property in the United States, not to Exceed Two Mills.

160. States Should Provide Employment for the Unemployed.

161. The Problem of the Unemployed Would be Overcome by the Federal Government Aiding the Unemployed to Settle on Unoccupied Land.

162. Corporations doing Interstate Business Should be Compelled to Take Out Federal Charter.

163. Statutory Provisions Should Limit the Amount of Property Transferable by Inheritance.

164. The United States Patent Law Should be Changed so as to Provide Absolute Protection to the One Who Secures the Patent Irrespective of the Claims of Other Parties.

165. The Life of a Patent Should be Continuous.

166. One Cent Letter Postage Should be Adopted.

167. Church Property Should be Subject to Taxation.



168. Speculation in Lands is Detrimental.

169. Lands Held for Speculation Should be Taxed Twice as Much as Other Lands.

170. The United States Should More Fully Develop Its Trade with Latin America.

171. The United States Government Should Own and Operate an Adequate Merchant Marine.

172. The Federal Government Should Aid in the Development of Water Power in the Interests of Coal Conservation.

173. Advertising is an Economic Saving.

174. The Guaranteed Net Profits to Railroads Should be Four Per Cent. on Capital Investment, and a Conservative Valuation be Placed on All Railroad Property.

175. Farmers Should Organize to Promote Direct Marketing, Giving Special Attention to Nearby Marketing Possibilities.

176. Woman's Industrial Activity has had a Large Influence on Present Economic Conditions.

177. A More Efficient Conservation Policy is Needed.

178. Municipalities Should Own Their Own Public Utilities.

179. The Federal Government Should Control All Lines of Communication in Time of Peace as Well as in Time of War.

180. The Federal Trust Laws Should be Strengthened.

181. Banking Regulations Should be Under the Control of the Federal Government.

182. A Permanent Policy of Price Fixing Should be Adopted by the United States.

183. The Federal Government Should Develop and Control All Water Power Sites not now Controlled by Private Interests.

184. Tariff on Farm Products is Beneficial to the Farmer.

185. The Tariff on Sugar Should be Removed.

186. Wool Should be Admitted to the United States Free of Duty.

187. Cotton Growers Should Co-operate to Secure Direct Marketing Arrangements.

188. Taxes Should be Assessed on Actual Valuation of Property.

189. A Sales Tax Should be Adopted by the Federal Government.

190. Taxes on Luxuries Should be Increased.

191. The Federal Tax on Tobacco Should be Doubled.

192. Income Taxes Should be Reduced to a Graduated Scale not to Exceed from One Per Cent. to Ten Per Cent., with Incomes of \$4,000 or less for Heads of Families to be Exempted.

193. The Protective Policy of the United States is no Longer Justified.

194. Henry Ford Should be Permitted to Operate the Muscle Shoals Project.

195. Mail Order Houses Mean Public Economy.

196. Mail Order Houses Tend to Concentrate Money in Large Cities to the Detriment of the Less Densely Populated Communities.

197. Government Aid to Shipping is Essential to the Highest Development of Our Foreign Commerce.

198. A Ship Subsidy Would Promote the General Economic Interests of the Commonwealth.

199. Producers and Consumers Should Co-operate to Secure Larger Returns to the Producer and Lower Prices to the Consumer.

200. The Cost of High Living is Responsible for the High Cost of Living.

201. The Budget System for State and National Government Conserves Public Funds.

202. Good Road Agitation is an Economic Handicap to the Farmer.

203. Road Improvements are Being made more rapidly than Economic Conditions Warrant.

204. Railroad Rates on Farm Products should be Materially Lowered.

205. Co-operative Packing Houses should be Established by the Farmers.

### **National Defense**

206. The United States Should Adopt a System of Compulsory Military Training Embodying the Principles of the Swiss Military System.

207. The United States Should Maintain a Standing Army of Five Hundred Thousand Men.

208. No Further Reduction Should be made in Our Armaments.

209. The United States Should take Steps to Establish more Coaling Stations.

210. Preparedness is Practical from the Economic Standpoint.

211. The Government Should Maintain an Efficient Corps of Chemists and Other Scientific Experts to Aid in Promoting Plans for National Defense.

212. Continued Preparedness is the Only Safe Procedure.

213. The United States Needs a Large Navy.

214. A Small Army is Sufficient for the American Commonwealth.

215. The Future Naval Program of the United States Should Aim to Keep the Navy on a Par with the Best in the World.

216. Further Disarmament Would be Unsafe for the Leading Nations of the World.

217. The Development of Science Makes Armaments of Little Value as a Means of Pre-

venting War, and for This Reason only Limited Armaments Should be Maintained.

218. The Nation Should Develop Its Aero-plane Service for National Defense.

219. The Panama Canal Should be as Strongly Fortified as Present Day Knowledge of Fortifications Makes Possible.

220. The United States Should Maintain a Small Navy that is Highly Efficient.

221. The United States Should Maintain a Navy only Large Enough for Police Duty.

222. The United States Should take the Lead Toward Further Disarmament.

### **Miscellaneous**

223. All Postmasters Should be Under Civil Service Regulations.

224. The Unanimous Decision in Jury Trials Should be Changed to a Three-Fourths Decision.

225. All Board of Trade Dealings in Futures Should be Prohibited.

226. Anglo Saxon Domination is Best for the World.

227. No Pensions Should be Paid to Ex-soldiers Unless the Money is Needed for Support.

228. Prison Sentences Should be Imposed for the Purpose of Reform Rather than Punishment.

229. There is Need for Distinct Prison Reform.

230. The United States Should Maintain Examining Boards at Ports of Embarkation for the Benefit of Foreigners Who Wish to Migrate to This Country.

231. Many Religious Denominations are Better for Civilization than Any One Would Be.

232. Churches Should Take an Active Part in Politics.

233. Churches Should Cease Raising Money by Engaging in Any Form of Business, either Temporary or Otherwise.

234. Fundamentalism is Necessary to the Protection of the Christian Religion.

235. Churches Should Cease to Engage in Controversies Over Scientific Theories.

236. Modern Liberalism in Doctrines Lessens Church Spirituality.

237. A Church Union Would Promote Christianity.

238. Moving Pictures are a Moral Menace to Society.

239. Moving Picture Theatres Should be Compelled to Remain Closed on Sunday.

240. Motion Pictures are Educationally Valuable.

241. Motion Pictures Misrepresent Life.

242. The Tendency of Moving Pictures to Displace Acting on the Stage has Resulted in a Lowering of Artistic Standards.

243. Capital Punishment is Justifiable.

244. There Should Be a Censorship of Books and Magazines.

245. The New Trend of Literature Indicates Lower Ideals.

246. The Foreign Influence on American Literature is Detrimental.

247. Free Speech Should Not Be Permitted to Those Who Uphold Radical Doctrines.

248. Printed Matter not Allowed to Circulate through the Mails by Reason of Its Undesirable Nature Should Be Entirely Suppressed.

249. The Government Should Take More Rigid Action Against Political and Economic Radicals.

250. The Success of Socialist Propaganda Would Mean the Backward Movement of Civilization.

**PART FIVE**  
**2**  
**Pros and Cons**





## CHAPTER IX

### PROS AND CONS

The points given under affirmative and negative headings in this section are for the purpose of helping the student to analyze the proposition, rather than being the result of analysis. No analysis should be attempted until the material is thoroughly studied.

The references give helps on both sides as well as general information. In a few instances a reference has been listed as negative, when the article cited is written largely in support of a proposition but does contain some material or suggested ideas that can be used in opposition to the proposition. The student should read thoughtfully, first with an open mind, then with an open mind combined with alertness to discover every possible idea or fact that might be utilized in defense of his own side of the case.

*Resolved, That United States Immigration Restrictions Should Be Lessened.*

#### **Affirmative**

I. Present restrictions impose a hardship on foreign people.

II. Restrictions are keeping out people who would doubtless become valuable citizens. Immigration has developed America.

III. The economic situation no longer makes the present restrictions imperative.

### **Negative**

I. The first thing to be considered in respect to immigration is the welfare of the United States.

II. Present restrictions are necessary to prevent more people coming than could be assimilated into our American life. There are multitudes here now who have not become assimilated.

III. There is no real need for more immigrants to be admitted for economic or any other reasons.

### **Books of General Interest**

Immigration Problems. J. W. Jenks and W. J. Lauck.

Immigration. P. F. Hall.

Immigration Races in North America. Peter Roberts.

Immigration and Its Effect Upon the United States. P. F. Hall.

Immigration and Labor. I. A. Hourwich.

Immigration and Americanization. P. Davis and B. Schwartz.

Immigration and the Future. F. A. Kellor.  
Our Foreigners. S. P. Orth.

On the Trail of the Immigrant. Edward A. Steiner.

From Alien to Citizen. Edward A. Steiner.

The Immigrant Tide. Edward A. Steiner.

The Immigrant, An Asset and a Liability. Frederic J. Haskin.

The Promised Land. Mary Antin.

Why Europe Leaves Home. K. L. Roberts.

Democracy and Assimilation. J. Drachsler.

Federal Administration and the Alien. F. A. Kellor.

New Viewpoints in American History. Arthur Meier Schlesinger, Chapter 1.

Government Reports:

Reports of the Bureau of Census.

Bureau of Industries and Immigration.

Immigration Commission.

### **Special Articles**

American by Choice. J. P. Gavit. Survey, Vol. 47, February 25, 1922, p. 815-21.

Cultural Aspects of Immigration. J. Draschler and R. E. Park. Proceedings National Conference of Social Work, 1921, p. 485-97.

How Restricted Immigration Works Out. W. W. Husband. Current History Magazine, Vol. 15, January 1922, p. 604.

Immigration Under the Percentum Limit Law, with Discussion. W. W. Husband. Pro-

ceedings National Conference of Social Work, 1922, p. 458-66.

Is the Melting Pot Spilling the Beans? Literary Digest, April 22, 1922, p. 15.

Letting Down the Bars. Independent, Vol. 110, April 28, 1923, p. 280.

No Immigrant Flood. New Republic. Vol. 33, December 13, 1922, p. 58-59.

Safeguarding the Gates to American Citizenship. Current Opinion, Vol. 74, February 1923, p. 201-3.

Shall We Let Down the Bars? C. C. Brinley. Independent Management, Vol. 65, April 1923, p. 247-49.

Soul of the Foreigner. Missionary Review of the World, Vol. 45, January 1922, p. 39-43.

Steve Tokacz: The Contractor's Point of View on Immigration. R. G. Kirk. Saturday Evening Post, February 17, 1923, p. 6.

Tragedy of the Excess Quota. E. Abbott. New Republic, Vol. 30, March 8, 1922, p. 52-53.

Turning of the Tide. N. DeBogory. Outlook, Vol. 133, January 24, 1923, p. 181-83.

Uses of Labor Shortage. New Republic, Vol. 33, February 14, 1923, p. 310-11.

What Next in Immigration Legislation? R. DeC. Ward. Scientific Monthly, Vol. 15, December 1922, p. 561-69.

### **Affirmative References**

Literary Digest, Nov. 18, 1922, p. 18. Missionary Review of the World, Vol. 45, p. 39. Nation, Vol. 115, p. 404. New Republic, Vol. 30, p. 52 and 93; Vol. 33, p. 310. Outlook, Vol. 132, p. 740. Survey, Vol. 49, p. 771. Harper's Monthly Magazine, Vol. 144, p. 505.

### **Negative References**

Collier's Weekly, May 6, 1922, p. 9. Current History Magazine, Vol. 15, p. 604. Literary Digest, Feb. 17, 1923, p. 14. North American Review, Vol. 215, p. 145. Outlook, Vol. 133, p. 181. Overland Monthly, Vol. 79, p. 27. Saturday Evening Post, Aug. 12, 1922, p. 10.

*Resolved, That Japanese and Chinese Should Be Admitted to United States Citizenship.*

### **Affirmative**

I. Japanese and Chinese have marked ability, are peaceable and have other excellent characteristics.

II. They assimilate with other people when given a chance.

III. Admitting them to citizenship would have a desirable influence on international affairs.

### **Negative**

I. Asiatics have many qualities that make them undesirable to Americans so that there would

be lack of harmony in exercising citizenship privileges.

II. Japanese and Chinese are distinctly different from Americans, they react differently to the same stimuli.

III. Giving these people the citizenship privilege is unnecessary, and would complicate relations between Asiatics and other countries.

### Special Articles

American Citizenship and the Japanese. R. Malcolm. *Annals of the American Academy*, Vol. 93, January 1921, p. 77.

Attitude of Chinese Towards Americans. P. S. Reinsch. *Annals of the American Academy*, Vol. 93, January 1921, p. 7.

Chinese in the United States. *Literary Digest*, November 1, 1919, p. 40.

Japan and American Citizenship. *Living Age*, Vol. 315, December 30, 1922, p. 737-38.

Japan's Position in the New Order. *Independent*, Vol. 107, December 24, 1921, p. 307-8.

Japanese Barred from Citizenship. *Literary Digest*, December 2, 1922, p. 14-15.

Japanese in the Melting Pot: Can They Assimilate and Make Good Citizens? V. S. McClatchy. *Annals of the American Academy*, Vol. 93, January 1921, p. 29-34.

Problem of American Born Japanese. R. Malcolm. Current History Magazine, Vol. 18, April 1923, p. 109.

Review of Exclusion History. W. Macarthur. Annals of the American Academy, Vol. 93, January 1921, p. 38.

Rising Tide of Japanese Resentment. Literary Digest, March 24, 1923, p. 18-19.

Supreme Court and the Japanese Question. Outlook, Vol. 132, November 29, 1922, p. 554.

### **Affirmative References**

Annals of the American Academy, Vol. 93, p. 69 and 81. Current Opinion, Vol. 73, p. 28. Freeman, Vol. 7, p. 5. Independent, Vol. 104, p. 267. Literary Digest, Sept. 11, 1920, p. 22; March 24, 1923, p. 18. Nation, Vol. 112, p. 173. New Republic, Vol. 24, p. 135. Outlook, Vol. 121, p. 207; Vol. 132, p. 554. School and Society, Vol. 16, p. 607.

### **Negative References**

Annals of the American Academy, Vol. 93, p. 23. Current Opinion, Vol. 73, p. 621. Literary Digest, July 31, 1920, p. 14. North American Review, Vol. 216, p. 808.

California and the Oriental. State Board of Control of California, 1920.

Chinese Immigration. Mary R. Coolidge.



*Resolved, That the United States should Cancel All Allied War Debts, including Those Debts for which Payment has been Arranged.*

### **Affirmative**

I. It would relieve European economic pressure.

II. It would be best from the standpoint of American economic welfare.

III. The spirit which America would show by cancellation would establish more friendly relations.

IV. It would be extremely difficult for the allies to pay, while it would not be a real burden for the United States to cancel the debts.

### **Negative**

I. Cancellation would be a dangerous precedent, tending to lessen the moral obligation of debt, which would react to Europe's economic disadvantage.

II. The debts can be paid in a way that will not disturb American economic conditions.

III. The United States has already shown a liberal spirit, nothing further need be done in this respect.

IV. The allies can pay in time, there is no necessity for immediate payment. Money they could save by military and naval expenditure re-

ductions would enable them to pay their debts without increasing taxation.

### Special Articles

American War Loans and Justice. O. T. Crosby. *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 130, December 1922, p. 825-32.

Analysis of the International War Debt Situation. R. C. Leffingwell. *Annals of the American Academy*, Vol. 102, July 1922, p. 108-15.

Anglo-American Financial Relations. H. Chisholm. *Fortnightly Review*, Vol. 119, March 1923, p. 382-89.

Between Europe and America. W. Steed. *Nineteenth Century*, Vol. 93, January 1923, p. 24-29.

Debts and Debtors, *Freeman*, Vol. 6, January 1923, p. 486.

Economics of the Allied Debt. *New Republic*, Vol. 28, November 9, 1921, p. 313-14.

French Point of View. A. Rostand. *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 130, October 1922, p. 559-61.

History of the Allied Debt. Mermeix. *Living Age*, Vol. 312, January 28, 1922, p. 193-96.

Hoover on the Debts. *New Republic*, Vol. 32, November 1, 1922, p. 234-36.

Public Financial Burdens of the Principal Countries of the World. L. R. Gottlieb. *Annals of the American Academy*, Vol. 102, July 1922, p. 115-20.

Settling the British Debt to America. Current History Magazine, Vol. 17, February 1923, p. 725-26.

Shall America Cancel Her Foreign Debts? T. B. McAdams. Outlook, Vol. 131, July 12, 1922, p. 468-70.

Shall the War Debts be Paid? Oswald Toynbee Falk. Our World, November 1922, p. 92.

Should the Allied Debts be Collected? H. Hoover. Review of Reviews, Vol. 66, December 1922, p. 643-44.

Shylock Strain in Uncle Sam. Literary Digest, February 18, 1922, p. 22.

The Credit of the Nations. Arthur Bullard. Our World, July 1922, p. 91.

Why the Cancellation of the War Debts would be Disastrous. Arthur Bullard. Our World, August 1922, p. 76.

World Debts. Some Comments and Opinions. T. W. Lamont. Pan-American Magazine, Vol. 35, November 1922, p. 234-37.

### **Affirmative References**

Annals of the American Academy, Vol. 95, p. 290; Vol. 96, p. 173. Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 130, p. 559. Banker's Magazine, Vol. 102, p. 997. Bellman, Vol. 26, p. 61. Forum, Vol. 65, p. 411. Independent, Vol. 107, p. 342; Vol. 108, p. 47;

Vol. 110, p. 7. Literary Digest, Nov. 5, 1921, p. 13; Feb. 18, 1922, p. 22. Living Age, Vol. 304, p. 643. Nation, Vol. 108, p. 137; Vol. 112, p. 282. Outlook, Vol. 127, p. 332. Our World, Nov. 1922, p. 88 and 92. Review of Reviews, Vol. 63, p. 394. World's Work, Vol. 43, p. 127.

### Negative References

Annals of the American Academy, Vol. 96, p. 166. Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 130, p. 825. Banker's Magazine, Vol. 99, p. 477. Current History Magazine, Vol. 17, p. 365. Current Opinion, Vol. 67, p. 333; Vol. 68, p. 445. Literary Digest, Dec. 10, 1921, p. 10. Nation, Vol. 115, p. 159. New Republic, Feb. 23, 1921, p. 356. Our World, July 1922, p. 91; Aug. 1922, p. 76; Sept. 1922, p. 79. Review of Reviews, Vol. 66, p. 260 and 643. Saturday Evening Post, Aug. 7, 1920, p. 14. Scribner's Magazine, Vol. 70, p. 769.

*Resolved, That the United States should Discontinue Its Monroe Doctrine Policy.*

### Affirmative

I. The Monroe Doctrine is an outgrown policy, no longer needed.

II. It stands in the way of the best international relations.

III. It is inconsistent in view of recent activities on the part of the United States.

### Negative

I. The Monroe Doctrine is a policy for the emergency and no one knows when an emergency may arise.

II. It does not interfere with the legitimate rights of any people.

III. The participation of the United States in European affairs has not been of such a nature as to violate the principles of the doctrine.

### Special Articles

Chateaubriand and the Monroe Doctrine. W. P. Cresson. North American Review, Vol. 217, April 1923, p. 475-87.

Italian Study of the Monroe Doctrine. Review of Reviews, Vol. 67, February 1923, p. 206-7.

Latin-American Views of the Monroe Doctrine. Review of Reviews, Vol. 65, March 1922, p. 327-28.

Monroe Doctrine and American Participation in European Affairs. W. E. Lingelbach. Annals of the American Academy, Vol. 96, July 1921, p. 33-41.

Monroe Doctrine Fundamentals. T. S. Woolsey. North American Review, Vol. 199, p. 833.

New Monroe Doctrine. E. J. Dillon. Living Age, Vol. 311, December 10, 1921, p. 632-38.

One Hundred Years of the Monroe Doctrine.  
J. A. Stewart. Review of Reviews, Vol. 63, May 1921, p. 514-16.

To Prevent the Balkanization of the World.  
T. Williams. World's Work, Vol. 37, February 1919, p. 445-48.

### **Affirmative References**

American Historical Review, Vol. 7, p. 77. Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 95, p. 567; Vol. 109, p. 172; Vol. 111, p. 721. Blackwoods, Vol. 195, p. 574. Century, Vol. 87, p. 233. Fortnightly Review, Vol. 76, p. 1013; Vol. 101, p. 671. Forum, Vol. 20, p. 456; Vol. 56, p. 525. Munsey's, Vol. 28, p. 488. Nation, Vol. 97, p. 556. North American Review, Vol. 173, p. 832; Vol. 176, p. 321 and 518; Vol. 180, p. 586; Vol. 198, p. 779. Outlook, Vol. 79, p. 710. Pan-American Magazine, Vol. 26, p. 152. Political Science Quarterly, Vol. 11, p. 30; Vol. 14, p. 355. Review of Reviews, Vol. 30, p. 351; Vol. 34, p. 114 and 244; Vol. 49, p. 104; Vol. 54, p. 452. World's Work, Vol. 37, p. 445.

### **Negative References**

Modern Political Institutions, Chapter XIII.  
S. E. Baldwin. American Ideals, Chapter II.  
Theodore Roosevelt. Pan-American Union Bulletin No. 34, p. 790.

Annals of the American Academy, Vol. 54, p. 20, 28, 119, and 124; Vol. 96, p. 33. Arena,

Vol. 23, p. 247. Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 109, p. 589. Bellman, Vol. 23, p. 510. Canadian Magazine, Vol. 25, p. 166. Independent, Vol. 52, p. 1101; Vol. 55, p. 9; Vol. 61, p. 119; Vol. 76, p. 328 and 540; Vol. 105, p. 49. International, Vol. 7, p. 30. Ladies' Home Journal, Dec. 1919, p. 37. National Review, Vol. 26, p. 595; Vol. 27, p. 156; Vol. 40, p. 871. Nineteenth Century, Vol. 53, p. 581. North American Review, Vol. 133, p. 523; Vol. 160, p. 651; Vol. 169, p. 448; Vol. 176, p. 185, 728 and 881; Vol. 212, p. 577. Outlook, Vol. 70, p. 371; Vol. 79, p. 366; Vol. 106, p. 582 and 832. Review of Reviews, Vol. 63, p. 514. World's Work, Vol. 25, p. 387; Vol. 28, p. 52.

*Resolved, That Our National Defenses should be Kept on a Par with those of Other Leading Nations, Including an Army and Navy Equal to those of Any Other Power.*

### **Affirmative**

I. Preparedness is sound protection.

II. We have paid a big price in the past for a lack of preparedness.

III. Our international interests are such that we need better defenses than the nation has required at any other time in its history.

### **Negative**

I. Preparedness does not prevent war.

II. The cost of maintaining national defenses is a heavy burden for the people, and the defenses are soon out of date.

III. The international spirit is developing toward better harmony between nations so that national defenses are becoming less essential.

### Special Articles

Always on Guard, the Navy in Peace. L. M. Overstreet. Outlook, Vol. 132, October 18, 1922, p. 290.

America's Land Defense Armament: Development Since the World War. F. J. Brunner. Outlook, Vol. 129, November 11, 1921, p. 433-35.

Cost of Unpreparedness. World's Work, Vol. 31, p. 32.

Discussion of National Defenses. J. J. Pershing. Saturday Evening Post, March 10, 1923, p. 3-4.

Europe's War Madness and Ours. Literary Digest, January 6, 1923, p. 11-12.

Japanese Reproof for Militarist America. Literary Digest, January 27, 1923, p. 22-23.

Scrapping Mahan. W. O. Stevens. Yale Review, Vol. 12, April 1923, p. 528-42.

Some American Naval Views. W. H. Gardiner. Fortnightly Review, Vol. 119, March 1923, p. 353-73.



### **Affirmative References**

Current History Magazine, Vol. 15, p. 591; Vol. 16, p. 32; Vol. 17, p. 395, 403 and 624. Illustrated World, Vol. 31, p. 829. Independent, Vol. 97, p. 116; Vol. 108, p. 389. Ladies' Home Journal, May 1922, p. 6. North American Review, Vol. 215, p. 331. Outlook, Vol. 131, p. 58; Vol. 132, p. 290. Saturday Evening Post, March 19, 1921, p. 8; March 10, 1923, p. 3. World's Work, Vol. 31, p. 32; Vol. 38, p. 352; Vol. 39, p. 33, 200, 275 and 380; Vol. 44, p. 106.

### **Negative References**

Good Housekeeping, Vol. 73, p. 15. Literary Digest, Jan. 6, 1923, p. 11; Jan. 27, 1923, p. 22. Review of Reviews, Vol. 64, p. 646. Scientific American, Vol. 122, p. 268; Vol. 123, p. 626.

*Resolved, That Further Steps should be taken  
Toward Disarmament.*

### **Affirmative**

I. It would be economically practical.

II. It would promote a better spirit among nations.

III. Steps taken toward disarmament indicate that more could be accomplished.

IV. The disarmament program should be made more nearly world wide.

### Negative

I. Disarmament below the point of military needs is never practical from an economic standpoint.

II. Conditions do not warrant further disarmament.

III. Further disarmament would not insure peace.

IV. There can be no further disarmament unless the leading nations act first and these need their armaments to protect themselves and weak nations.

### Special Articles

Guaranteeing Peace in Europe. Nation, Vol. 116, April 18, 1923, p. 477.

Japanese Press Cries for More Arms Reduction. Literary Digest, August 26, 1922, p. 17-18.

Reduction of Armaments. L. Woolf. Contemporary Review, Vol. 122, November 1922, p. 648-52.

Weighing Armaments in God's Scales. W. G. Shepherd. Good Housekeeping, Vol. 73, December 1921, p. 15-16.

What is Adequate Disarmament. H. Davis. Independent, Vol. 105, May 21, 1921, p. 536.

Why Europe is Bankrupt. F. W. Hirst. Saturday Evening Post, February 18, 1922, p. 21.

Will Total Disarmament Prevent War? L. M. Overstreet. Outlook, Vol. 130, April 12, 1922, p. 597.

### **Affirmative References**

Fortnightly Review, Vol. 116, p. 882. Good Housekeeping, Vol. 73, p. 15. Independent, Vol. 107, p. 199. Literary Digest, Nov. 12, 1921, p. 31; Nov. 26, 1921, p. 13; Aug. 26, 1922, p. 17. Nation, Vol. 116, p. 159 and 477. New Republic, Vol. 29, p. 3. Saturday Evening Post, Feb. 18, 1922, p. 21. Yale Review, Vol. 11, p. 269.

### **Negative References**

Current History Magazine, Vol. 16, p. 1022. Freeman, Vol. 7, p. 52. Literary Digest, Dec. 16, 1922, p. 10. Nineteenth Century, Vol. 91, p. 300; Vol. 92, p. 17. Outlook, Vol. 130, p. 597. Review of Reviews, Vol. 60, p. 330.

*Resolved, That the United States should take an Active Part in Supporting a World Court.*

### **Affirmative**

I. The world court is practical.

II. The United States should not hold aloof from any good international activity.

III. The position of the United States in the world makes it essential that this nation take an active part in the world court to insure its unqualified success.

### Negative

I. The world court has only limited possibilities for good.

II. Participation in the activities of the world court would embroil the United States in international affairs.

III. The United States has been of large world service during the past decade while maintaining a so-called isolated policy, and there is insufficient evidence to show that it is necessary for the welfare of the world for the United States to support a world court.

### Special Articles

Can a Court Prevent War? Outlook, Vol. 133, February 28, 1923, p. 391-92.

Let Us Join the World Court of Justice. Nation, Vol. 116, March 7, 1923, p. 258.

New Hague Court at Work. W. A. DuPuy. Current History Magazine, Vol. 17, October 1922, p. 92-95.

Opening of the World Court at The Hague. Current History Magazine, Vol. 16, April 1922, p. 87.

Peace by Law in the Far East. W. Hard. Asia, Vol. 22, February 1922, p. 134.

President Harding's Plea for the World Court. Current History Magazine, Vol. 18, April 1923, p. 38-39.

Shall America Support the New World Court? M. O. Hudson. Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 131, January 1923, p. 129-36.

Starting the Fight to Join the Peace Court. Literary Digest, March 10, 1923, p. 7-9.

Warless World. M. M. Bodkin. Fortnightly Review, Vol. 116, December 1921, p. 896-906.

World Court Movement. C. P. Anderson. North American Review, Vol. 212, November 1920, p. 594.

### **Affirmative References**

Asia, Vol. 22, p. 134. Current History Magazine, Vol. 18, p. 38. Fortnightly Review, Vol. 116, p. 896. Nation, Vol. 116, p. 258. Outlook, Vol. 133, p. 391.

### **Negative References**

Annals of the American Academy, Vol. 96, p. 132. Literary Digest, Sept. 11, 1920, p. 11; March 10, 1923, p. 7. Nineteenth Century, Vol. 85, p. 265.

*Resolved, That the United States and Canada should Develop the St. Lawrence River Deep Waterway as a Joint Project.*

### **Affirmative**

I. It would put the central part of the respective countries in close touch with outside mar-

kets so that products could be more economically exported.

II. It would permit full development of agricultural and industrial resources without congesting railroads with excessive traffic.

III. Both countries would derive benefit from the waterway and should share in the expense.

### **Negative**

I. The expense of the project would be enormous and the returns doubtful.

II. It would disorganize commerce, especially the commerce of the United States.

III. It would benefit one part of each country to the detriment of another part. The benefits would not be general.

### **Special Articles**

All the Way by Water. Independent, Vol. 101, February 28, 1920, p. 336-37.

Duluth to Liverpool in one Bottom. Robert G. Skerrett. Scientific American, Vol. 122, June 19, 1920, p. 670.

From the Great Lakes to the Atlantic. Charles P. Craig. Saturday Evening Post, June 26, 1920, p. 40-48.

Great Lakes Seaway. Julius H. Barnes. Review of Reviews, Vol. 61, August 1922, p. 181-85.

Hostility of New York Revealed in St. Lawrence Canal Project. *Current Opinion*, Vol. 72, May 1922, p. 689-91.

Making Seaports of the Middle West. Katherine Louise Smith. *Independent*, Vol. 104, October 30, 1920, p. 165.

Ocean Ports for Inland Cities. *Literary Digest*, November 13, 1920, p. 19-20.

Practicability of Inland Water Routes. *Illustrated World*, Vol. 34, December 1920, p. 629-31.

St. Lawrence Cut-off. Hugh J. Hughes. *Review of Reviews*, Vol. 61, June 1920, p. 630-31.

St. Lawrence River Canal, Denounced and Championed. *Current Opinion*, Vol. 72, February 1922, p. 265-67.

St. Lawrence Outlet to the Sea. Katherine Louise Smith. *Outlook*, Vol. 127, March 2, 1921, p. 340-42.

St. Lawrence Route. H. de Selding. *Outlook*, Vol. 133, December 27, 1922, p. 734.

St. Lawrence Project. *New Republic*, Vol. 29, February 8, 1922, p. 298-300.

To Make Our Great Lakes Ocean Ports. *Literary Digest*, March 18, 1922, p. 16-18.

Transportation by Water. *Literary Digest*, January 1, 1921, p. 42.

Will the Atlantic Seaboard be Moved into the Mississippi Valley? *World's Work*, Vol. 44, August 1922, p. 356-58.

### **Affirmative References**

Current Opinion, Vol. 72, p. 265. Independent, Vol. 101, p. 336; Vol. 108, p. 299. Illustrated World, Vol. 34, p. 629. Literary Digest, Nov. 13, 1920, p. 19. New Republic, Vol. 22, p. 285. Outlook, Vol. 127, p. 340. Review of Reviews, Vol. 61, p. 630; Vol. 66, p. 181. Saturday Evening Post, June 26, 1920, p. 40. Scientific American, Vol. 123, p. 442.

### **Negative References**

Current Opinion, Vol. 72, p. 689. Literary Digest, Jan. 1, 1921, p. 42; March 18, 1922, p. 16. Nation's Business, March 1922, p. 22. New Republic, Vol. 29, p. 298. Saturday Evening Post, June 5, 1920, p. 35.

*Resolved, That the United States Ex-Soldiers of the World War should be Paid a Bonus by the Federal Government, the Bonus to take the place of Future Pensions.*

### **Affirmative**

I. The bonus plan is just.

II. It is practical for both the ex-soldiers and the public.

III. It would mean an ultimate saving to the public.

IV. It would not be a real hardship for the United States to meet the cost.



### Negative

I. The bonus plan is unsound since it would not compensate the ex-soldiers in accordance with their individual needs.

II. A bonus puts a cash value on patriotism.

III. It would be better for the ex-soldiers to receive a pension in future years instead of a bonus now, for they would always be assured of some protection.

IV. The bonus would increase taxation which is already high.

### Special Articles

Adjusted Compensation. Outlook, Vol. 132, September 13, 1922, p. 52.

Bonus a Question of Principle and not of Finance. Independent, Vol. 108, February 25, 1922, p. 190.

Bonus Flounderings. Independent, Vol. 108, March 11, 1922, p. 255.

Bonus Project. E. T. Devine. Survey, Vol. 44, May 8, 1920, p. 204.

If the Soldier Gets His Bonus. Literary Digest, July 9, 1921, p. 10-11.

Justice and the Bonus. Review, Vol. 2, April 10, 1920, p. 351.

Planning a Painless Bonus. Literary Digest, March 18, 1922, p. 11-12.

Secretary Mellon on the Proposed Bonus. Independent, Vol. 108, February 4, 1922, p. 109-10.

States and the Soldier Bonus. Review of Reviews, Vol. 62, October 1920, p. 426-27.

Woman's View of the Bonus. Review, Vol. 2, May 1, 1920, p. 458.

### **Affirmative References**

Current History Magazine, Vol. 16, p. 545. Independent, Vol. 108, p. 52 and 190. Literary Digest, March 20, 1920, p. 28. New Republic, Vol. 27, p. 168; Vol. 30, p. 157. Outlook, Vol. 125, p. 18; Vol. 128, p. 511; Vol. 130, p. 332; Vol. 132, p. 181. Review, Vol. 2, p. 351 and 458. World's Work, Vol. 40, p. 116.

### **Negative References**

Independent, Vol. 106, p. 123; Vol. 108, p. 109. Literary Digest, March 20, 1920, p. 28; Feb. 11, 1922, p. 7. Outlook, Vol. 130, p. 398; Vol. 132, p. 52. World's Work, Vol. 43, p. 460.

*Resolved, That the Prohibition Law be Revised to Legalize Beer and Light Wines.*

### **Affirmative**

I. Difficulty in enforcing the law and the sentiment generally expressed indicates that a large percentage of the people do not favor abso-

lute prohibition. Prohibition came before the country was ready for it.

II. Legalizing beer and light wines would satisfy the demand for liquor and possibly prevent the repeal of the prohibition amendment.

III. The results of prohibition have been disappointing.

### **Negative**

I. Those who want intoxicating liquor are the ones who express their views, those who favor prohibition say little. The significant factor of the Literary Digest poll was not the number who favored modification of the law, but the number who did not reply.

II. Legalizing beer and light wines would be an entering wedge which would doubtless lead to the return of all the other liquors.

III. The results of prohibition have been beneficial even though not as noteworthy as had been anticipated. The strength of the liquor evil had not been realized until the national prohibition law came into existence.

### **Special Articles**

America and the Three Mile Limit. G. Glasgow. Contemporary Review, Vol. 123, January 1923, p. 116.

Beating About the Prohibition Bush. F. H. Walnut. Survey, Vol. 48, April 29, 1922, p. 151-55.

Beer and Light Wines. Outlook, Vol. 133, March 14, 1923, p. 492.

Booze Complex. S. G. Blythe. Saturday Evening Post, March 4, 1922, p. 6-7.

Facing the Facts of Prohibition. W. B. Wheeler. Current History Magazine, Vol. 16, May 1922, p. 195-202.

Is Prohibition a Failure? R. H. Gillett. Current History Magazine, Vol. 17, October 1922, p. 48-54.

Is the Volstead Act a Failure? E. I. Edwards. Current History Magazine, Vol. 17, January 1923, p. 665-68.

Northcliffe on Prohibition. F. Crane. Current Opinion, Vol. 71, December 1921, p. 724.

Poll of Best Minds on Rum Returns. Literary Digest, June 10, 1922, p. 16.

Relative Values in Prohibition. L. Graves. Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 127, April 1921, p. 524-28.

Shall Constitutional Government Endure? W. B. Wheeler. Current History Magazine, Vol. 16, August 1922, p. 845-48.

Shall it be Again? F. Schoenemann. Freeman, Vol. 6, January 3, 1923, p. 398-99.

Success and Failure of Prohibition. Current Opinion, Vol. 70, January 1921, p. 35.

Three Years of Prohibition: Success or Failure? J. C. Welliver. Review of Reviews, Vol. 65, June 1922, p. 607.

Three Years of Prohibition, Interview with R. A. Haynes. W. P. Helm, Jr. Outlook, Vol. 133, March 21, 1923, p. 536-38.

Wet Washington. W. S. McNutt. Collier's Weekly, January 27, 1923, p. 5.

What has Prohibition Done? E. Tilton. World's Work, Vol. 44, July 1922, p. 303-6.

Why Bootlegging Flourishes. H. L. Scaife. Current History Magazine, Vol. 18, May 1923, p. 235.

### **Affirmative References**

Collier's Weekly, July 16, 1921, p. 6. Current History Magazine, Vol. 17, p. 665; Vol. 18, p. 235. Current Opinion, Vol. 70, p. 35; Vol. 71, p. 724. Independent, Vol. 108, p. 576. Literary Digest, March 25, 1922, p. 14; Dec. 17, 1921, p. 28; June 10, 1922, p. 16. Living Age, Vol. 303, p. 301. Nation, Vol. 108, p. 271. Outlook, Vol. 133, p. 740; Vol. 131, p. 91. Survey, Vol. 48, p. 151.

### **Negative References**

Current History Magazine, Vol. 16, p. 195. Current Opinion, Vol. 70, p. 35. Forum, Vol. 62, p. 68. Independent, Vol. 102, p. 126; Vol. 109, p. 123. Ladies' Home Journal, Dec. 1922, p. 14; January 1923, p. 23. Literary Digest, July 12, 1919, p. 32; Dec. 20, 1919, p. 54; Oct. 9, 1920, p. 36; April 29, 1922, p. 32. Missionary Review of the World, Vol. 42, p. 347. Outlook, Vol. 133,

p. 262 and 492. Proceedings National Conference of Social Work, 1919, p. 763; 1920, p. 233; 1921, p. 133. Review of Reviews, Vol. 65, p. 607. School and Society, Vol. 16, p. 73. World's Work, Vol. 44, p. 303.

*Resolved, That the Closed Shop should be Universally Adopted.*

### **Affirmative**

I. The closed shop minimizes labor troubles for many labor wars result from disagreement over recognition of the closed shop.

II. The closed shop tends to bring about better labor conditions, benefiting society as well as labor.

III. The closed shop is just in principle.

### **Negative**

I. The closed shop places a dangerous power in the hands of the labor element.

II. Industrial progress is weakened by the closed shop, the open shop encouraging individual effort.

III. The closed shop is unjust to employers and to the employees as individuals.

### **Special Articles**

Open Shop and the Motives Back of It. R. E. Fox. Independent Management, Vol. 61, January 1, 1921, p. 37-39.

Open Shop Encyclopedia. Survey, Vol. 46, May 14, 1921, p. 211-12.

Organization of an Open Shop under the Midvale Plan. E. Wilson. Annals of the American Academy, Vol. 85, September 1919, p. 214-19.

Packers and the Open Shop. Swift & Company. Survey, Vol. 47, November 5, 1921, p. 224.

Principle of the Closed Shop. R. F. Cutting. Review, Vol. 1, October 11, 1919, p. 473-74.

Steel and the Open Shop. Independent, Vol. 105, January 1, 1921, p. 16-17.

Strike Insurance and the Closed Shop. Review, Vol. 3, November 24, 1920, p. 491-92.

Substance and the Shadow. N. Sargent. Outlook, Vol. 132, October 4, 1922, p. 209-10.

Wages and the Closed Shop. M. T. Quigg. Review, Vol. 4, January 26, 1921, p. 79.

### **Affirmative References**

Literary Digest, Feb. 19, 1921, p. 32. New Republic, Vol. 25, p. 335 and 375. Outlook, Vol. 125, p. 17. Review, Vol. 3, p. 491; Vol. 4, p. 78. Survey, Vol. 43, p. 53; Vol. 45, p. 830.

### **Negative References**

American Economical Review, Vol. 8, p. 752. Annals of the American Academy, Vol. 85, p. 214. Current Opinion, Vol. 68, p. 248. Nation, Vol. 109, p. 488; Vol. 111, p. 609. New Republic, Vol. 25, p. 375. Review, Vol. 4, p. 79. Survey, Vol. 43, p. 57; Vol. 46, p. 700.

*Resolved, That the United States should Subsidize Its Merchant Marine.*

### **Affirmative**

I. It would enable American shipping to compete on more nearly equal terms with foreign shipping.

II. It would be an incentive to the development of a permanent operating merchant marine.

III. The general benefits derived from the merchant marine would more than offset the amount paid by the public to shipping interests.

IV. It would not be establishing a precedent for the government subsidized railroad construction by land grants, insuring to the public shipping facilities in all parts of the country.

### **Negative**

I. Subsidizing the merchant marine would not mean lower rates since it is necessary for a subsidy to enable American ships to compete with foreign shipping.

II. The problem is to find markets for goods rather than a means of transportation; subsidizing the merchant marine would not develop new markets.

III. The subsidy would tax the general public for the benefit of a single industry.



IV. There is no more reason for subsidizing the merchant marine than any other industry of interest to the country's general welfare, since adequate shipping facilities now exist.

### **Books and Special Articles**

The New Merchant Marine. Edwin N. Hurley.

United States Shipping Board. Annual Reports, 1917 to 1923, inclusive.

Administration and the Merchant Marine. E. N. Dingley. Review of Reviews, Vol. 66, December 1922, p. 609-12.

A Free Trader will Surrender to Facts. George H. Putnam. Outlook, Vol. 130, May 22, 1922, p. 459-61.

American Shipping Bill. C. E. Fayle. Edinburgh Review, Vol. 236, July 1922, p. 132-41.

Futility of the Subsidy. New Republic, July 26, 1922, p. 239-40.

Ship Subsidy and the Farmer. Review of Reviews, Vol. 66, August 1922, p. 199-200.

Ship Subsidy Policies of Foreign Governments. Annalist, Oct. 2, 16, 23, 30, Nov. 6 and 13, 1922, Vol. 20, p. 323, 383, 416, 441, 468 and 503.

Subsidy as a Farmer Sees It. H. J. Sconce. Nation's Business, Vol. 10, May 1922, p. 24.

A. B. C. of the Subsidy Bill. Outlook, Vol. 133, January 31, 1923, p. 209-10.

### **Affirmative References**

Congressional Record, 62, p. 4538, 9499, 9624, 9720, 10451 and 10683. Country Gentleman, July 8, 1922, p. 11. Nation's Business, May 1922, p. 22; June 1922, p. 28. Outlook, Vol. 130, p. 455 and 459. Review of Reviews, Vol. 66, p. 199. Scientific American, Vol. 127, p. 164. United States Shipping Board Reports.

### **Negative References**

Congressional Record, 62, p. 8667, 9116, 9191 and 10373. Current Opinion, Vol. 73, p. 582. Edinburgh Review, Vol. 236, p. 132. Nation, Vol. 114, p. 306; Vol. 115, p. 4 and 162. Nation's Business, June 1922, p. 30. New Republic, Vol. 31, p. 171 and 239. World's Work, Vol. 43, p. 461.

*Resolved, That the Federal Government should Own and Operate the Railroads.*

### **Affirmative**

I. It would protect the interests of the public.

II. Government ownership and control would enable the government to meet emergencies promptly.

III. The public would be assured of continuous service.

IV. Government ownership of railroads has been tried successfully in other countries.

### Negative

I. Government control of railroads during the war does not give the public confidence in government ownership and control.

II. Governments are unable to cope satisfactorily with business propositions.

III. Government ownership would place a dangerous power in the hands of politicians.

IV. The experience in other countries has not been entirely satisfactory.

### Special Articles

American Railroad Outlook. W. Z. Ripley. North American Review, Vol. 215, April 1922, p. 433-48.

American Railway Fallacy. S. O. Dunn. North American Review, Vol. 215, June 1922, p. 721-32.

Case for Government Operation and Ownership. W. L. Stonex. Annals of the American Academy, Vol. 86, November 1919, p. 67-76.

Defence of the Government's Management. C. E. Griffin. Nation, Vol. 109, August 16, 1919, p. 216.

Fair Way for the Government to Take Over the Railroads. Current Opinion, Vol. 66, May 1919, p. 334.

Government Ownership or What? New Republic, Vol. 33, February 7, 1923, p. 266-67.

Government Ownership of Railroads: A Catechism. Nation, Vol. 116, February 21, 1923, p. 204-5.

Government Ownership and Railroad Organization. H. Reid. Public, Vol. 22, May 3, 1919, p. 460.

Government Ownership and Individual Enterprise; the Views of Charles M. Schwab. D. Wilhelm. Scribner's Magazine, Vol. 66, July 1919, p. 99-101.

Inside Facts on Government Control of Railroads. W. D. Hines. Independent, Vol. 101, March 27, 1920, p. 466-67.

Progress on Railroad Problems. Independent, Vol. 107, November 26, 1921, p. 205-6.

Railroads Under Government Operation. W. J. Cunningham. Quarterly Journal Economics. Vol. 35, February 1921, p. 288-340; Vol. 36, November 1921, p. 30-71.

Railways (Great Britain) Under Government Operation. Literary Digest, April 19, 1919, p. 140.

Red Tape, Railroads and Government Management. A. E. Davies. Living Age, Vol. 302, August 30, 1919, p. 548-54.

### **Affirmative References**

Annals of the American Academy, Vol. 76, p. 157; Vol. 86, p. 67 and 77. Century, Vol. 103, p. 406, 570 and 760; Vol. 104, p. 123. Current

Opinion, Vol. 66, p. 72 and 334. Independent, Vol. 87, p. 439; Vol. 93, p. 219. Nation, Vol. 109, p. 208 and 216. Outlook, Vol. 121, p. 552. Public, Vol. 22, p. 460, 768 and 926. Review of Reviews, Vol. 59, p. 206.

### Negative References

Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 115, p. 202; Vol. 129, p. 106. Contemporary Review, Vol. 117, p. 457. Forum, Vol. 61, p. 22. Independent, Vol. 97, p. 123; Vol. 99, p. 239 and 324; Vol. 100, p. 229. Journal Political Economy, Vol. 24, p. 547. Literary Digest, April 12, 1919, p. 144; Sept. 20, 1919, p. 27. Living Age, Vol. 302, p. 548. Nation, Vol. 110, p. 845; Vol. 112, p. 469 and 594. New Republic, Vol. 21, p. 132. Public, Vol. 22, p. 460. Review of Reviews, Vol. 60, p. 595. Scribner's Magazine, Vol. 66, p. 99.

*Resolved, That the Railway Labor Board should have Compulsory Power to Enforce Its Decisions.*

### Affirmative

I. Without such power it is unable to bring about practical results.

II. The railway situation demands that further power be given to the board.

III. Such power as proposed would eliminate the necessity for more drastic action.

### Negative

I. Compulsion without satisfaction is not a settlement of difficulties.

II. Employers and employees would be compelled to surrender their individual rights to the board.

III. Compulsory power should be used only as a last resort and the labor board has not shown that it has tried every other means to produce satisfactory results.

### Special Articles

Arbitration and Industrial Justice. Basil M. Manly. Survey, Vol. 48, April 8, 1922, p. 44-46.

Decisions of the Railroad Labor Board. Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 11, September 1920, p. 100.

Power and Weakness of the Railroad Labor Board. Literary Digest, July 15, 1922, p. 12-13.

Railway Arbitration Fails. New Republic, Vol. 31, July 19, 1922, p. 199-201.

Railway Labor Board's Award. Current History Magazine, Vol. 12, September 1920, p. 1101-2.

The Railroad Struggle. Survey, Vol. 45, February 12, 1921, p. 699-700.

What the Shop Strike Cost the Railroads. Evans Clark, Nation, Vol. 115, December 27, 1922, p. 715-16.

### **Affirmative References**

Consult issues of the Monthly Labor Review. American Law Review, Vol. 55, p. 387. Congressional Record, Vol. 58, p. 4599, 4834, 8357; Vol. 59, p. 144, 731 and 1313. Literary Digest, July 15, 1922, p. 12. Railway Age, Vol. 68, p. 239; Vol. 73, p. 1149. Survey, Vol. 43, p. 638.

### **Negative References**

Congressional Record, Vol. 59, p. 576, 809 and 815. Railway Age, Vol. 67, p. 622 and 691. Survey, Vol. 48, p. 44.

*Resolved, That no more Tax Exempt Bonds should be Issued by the Federal Government, the States, or Municipalities.*

### **Affirmative**

I. Tax exempt bonds have been issued in such amounts as to disturb the economic situation.

II. Capitalists are escaping their just share of the taxes.

III. Capitalists are putting their money into tax free bonds instead of industrial enterprises, to the detriment of the nation's industrial welfare.

### **Negative**

I. Tax exemption makes possible the sale of bonds at a better advantage.

II. Tax exemption means lower interest rate. Less cost to the public means less money to be

raised through taxation. Capitalists loan their money on a basis of net returns so that the public would ultimately save nothing by taxing bonds.

III. As large capitalists put their money into bonds the smaller investors put their money into industries. The number of such investors has increased rapidly in recent years.

### **Special Articles**

How Tax Exemption has Boosted Municipal Borrowing. Literary Digest, January 27, 1923, p. 64.

Income Taxation and Tax Exempt Securities. F. Franklin. Independent, Vol. 110, January 6, 1923, p. 17-18.

Public Debt Mania. G. Garrett. Saturday Evening Post, January 13, 1923, p. 3-4.

Tax Exempt Securities. E. S. Corwin. New Republic, Vol. 33, January 31, 1923, p. 243-45.

Tax Exempt Securities vs. Progressive Income Tax. R. M. Haig. North American Review, Vol. 217, April 1923, p. 433-42.

What's Wrong About Tax-exempt Incomes. Independent, Vol. 107, December 24, 1921, p. 315.

### **Affirmative References**

Independent, Vol. 107, p. 315; Vol. 110, p. 17. Literary Digest, Jan. 20, 1923, p. 10; Jan. 27, 1923, p. 64. North American Review, Vol. 217, p. 433.



### Negative References

Annals of the American Academy, Vol. 88, p. 156. Independent, Vol. 91, p. 36. Review, Vol. 5, p. 134. Review of Reviews, Vol. 54, p. 238.

*Resolved, That the Single Tax should be Substituted for the General Property Tax.*

### Affirmative

I. It would tend to increase improvements.

II. Lands held for speculation would be thrown on the market, sold in small tracts and fully developed.

III. There would be more opportunities for labor and capital with better returns.

IV. It would place the burden of taxation on the owners of natural resources.

### Negative

I. The change in taxation would involve many hardships, natural resources being taxed excessively.

II. Single tax would upset the economic equilibrium.

III. It would lessen the desire to own real estate to be taxed, decreasing values.

IV. Returns resulting from improvements must ultimately pay the taxes so that in the end we would be where we started in the beginning.

**Books and Special Articles**

The Single Tax Movement in the United States. Arthur N. Young.

Taxation and Land Values. H. S. Bigelow.

Progress and Poverty. Henry George.

Essays in Taxation. E. R. A. Seligman.

Privilege and Democracy in America. F. C. Howe.

Natural Taxation. Thomas G. Sherman.

Property and Progress. William Hurrell Mallock.

Land Reform in California. J. H. Ryckman. Public, Vol. 22, January 4, 1919, p. 15-16.

Progressive Tax on Bare Land Values. J. R. Commons. Political Science Quarterly, Vol. 37, March 1922, p. 41-68.

Trial of the Single Tax in China. E. McCormick. Outlook, Vol. 127, April 13, 1921, p. 585.

**Affirmative References**

Democracy vs. Socialism. Hirsch Max.

Single Tax. G. T. Watts.

Single Tax, What It Is. Henry George.

Single Tax, What It Will Accomplish. Judson Grennell.

American Magazine, Vol. 72, p. 221 and 335; Vol. 75, p. 52. Arena, Vol. 24, p. 645; Vol. 35, p. 366. Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 112, p. 737. Cen-

tury, Vol. 40, p. 394. Everybody's, Vol. 26, p. 507. Forum, Vol. 52, p. 165. Outlook, Vol. 103, p. 771. Public, Vol. 17, p. 272, 1012, 1085, 1185; Vol. 21, p. 506 and 787. Review, Vol. 5, p. 187. Westminster Review, Vol. 167, p. 244; Vol. 172, p. 371.

### **Negative References**

Single Tax a Fallacy. E. B. Silvers.

Single Tax Exposed. Charles H. Shields.

Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 113, p. 27. Century, Vol. 40, p. 286; Vol. 42, p. 722. Forum, Vol. 3, p. 433. Independent, Vol. 64, p. 815. Nineteenth Century, Vol. 65, p. 191; Vol. 72, p. 96. North American Review, Vol. 137, p. 147. Popular Science Monthly, Vol. 36, p. 481. Review, Vol. 5, p. 222. Survey, Vol. 31, p. 697.

*Resolved, That Henry Ford should be Permitted to take over the Muscle Shoals Project.*

### **Affirmative**

I. Ford has demonstrated his ability to handle a big industrial enterprise economically.

II. The Ford proposition would mean full development of the project and that is what the country needs.

III. Ford's proposition is fair, taking everything into consideration. Values are not as great as during war time.

### Negative

I. It is a poor policy for the government to turn over national resources to private enterprise.

II. The United States would be running too great a risk in trusting future unknown private interests to protect the rights of the public.

III. Muscle Shoals is so valuable that to permit Henry Ford to take over the project would be making a huge donation.

### Special Articles

Greatest Industrial Enterprise since the Panama Canal. L. McClung. Illustrated World, Vol. 36, February 1922, p. 825-30.

Henry Ford Goes Bargain Hunting. Nation, Vol. 115, December 20, 1922, p. 683.

Muscle Shoals and Permanent Agriculture. W. H. Strowd. Outlook, Vol. 130, April 26, 1922, p. 698-99.

Muscle Shoals in Congress. Congressional Digest, 2, October 1922, p. 8-22.

Muscle Shoals Power and Industrial Project. J. C. Welliver. Review of Reviews, Vol. 65, April 1922, p. 381-94.

What do We Know of Henry Ford's Great Grandson? Outlook, Vol. 131, June 21, 1922, p. 330-33.

Why Henry Ford Wants the Muscle Shoals Property. Current Opinion, Vol. 72, February 1922, p. 262-64.

### **Affirmative References**

Current Opinion, Vol. 72, p. 262. Illustrated World, Vol. 37, p. 183. Scientific American, Vol. 127, p. 156. Literary Digest, January 28, 1922, p. 10.

### **Negative References**

Congressional Digest 2, p. 8. Nation, Vol. 115, p. 683. Outlook, Vol. 131, p. 330. Review of Reviews, Vol. 65, p. 381.

*Resolved, That a Federal Department of Education should be Created with the Head of that Department a Member of the President's Cabinet.*

### **Affirmative**

I. It would nationalize education, and education is one of the most important factors of our national welfare.

II. It would put education on a par with other interests which has never been done in the United States.

III. The Bureau of Education connected with the Interior Department is inadequate to meet the educational needs of the nation.

### **Negative**

I. It would place education on a political basis which would be detrimental to the best interests of the nation.

II. Our educational progress is such that it is evident that the present system will suffice in the future without making the proposed change.

III. The Bureau of Education can accomplish all that is necessary in a national way. There is nothing practical that could be done by a department that cannot be done by the Bureau.

### **Special Articles**

Chamber of Commerce and the Towner-Sterling Bill. Educational Review, Vol. 65, March 1923, p. 176-77.

Documents on the Towner-Sterling Bill. School and Society, Vol. 16, July 29, 1922, p. 133-40.

Federal Department of Education. School and Society, Vol. 14, November 19, 1921, p. 455.

Fight to the Finish. National Education Association Journal, Vol. 12, April 1923, p. 144-45.

Need of National Organization for Educational Service. O. M. Jones. Educational Review, Vol. 63, May 1922, p. 395-401.

Petition for a Federal Department of Education. School Review, Vol. 29, December 1921, p. 726-28.

Secretary Fall's Argument for a Department of Education. National Education Association Journal, Vol. 12, March 1923, p. 103.

President's Plan for a Department including Education. School Review, Vol. 31, April 1923, p. 243-45.

Secretary of Education. Nation, Vol. 108, May 15, 1919, p. 786.

Why We Need a Secretary of Education. G. D. Strayer. Elementary School Journal, Vol. 20, April 1920, p. 593-99.

### **Affirmative References**

Educational Review, Vol. 60, p. 271; Vol. 63, p. 395. Elementary School Journal, Vol. 20, p. 593. School and Society, Vol. 15, p. 113; Vol. 16, p. 250; Vol. 17, p. 210. School Review, Vol. 29, p. 726; Vol. 31, p. 243. National Education Association Journal, Vol. 12, p. 103.

### **Negative References**

Educational Review, Vol. 60, p. 285. Literary Digest, April 16, 1921, p. 26. School and Society, Vol. 17, p. 181.

*Resolved, That the Ku Klux Klan is Detrimental to the Best Interests of America.*

### **Affirmative**

I. It weakens stable government.

II. It substitutes mob rule for rule by constituted authorities.

III. It gives evil minded persons an opportunity to hide behind the klan in performing acts

of violence or other criminal acts, the officers of the organization being unable to prevent the misuse of white robes and other insignia.

### **Negative**

I. The klan stands for patriotic principles.

II. The klan has accomplished much good.

III. The klan is not responsible for evil deeds perpetrated in its name or supposedly sanctioned by it. It is always ready to be thoroughly investigated.

### **Special Articles**

Historic Pulaski. Birthplace of the Ku Klux Klan. Methodist Publishing Company, Nashville, Tenn. 1913.

In Darkest Louisiana. L. L. Cline. Nation, Vol. 116, March 14, 1923, p. 292-3.

Invisible Government. Outlook, Vol. 132, December 13, 1922, p. 643.

Klan as a National Problem, Literary Digest, December 2, 1922, p. 12-13.

Ku Klux Klan. Its Social Origin in the South. F. Tannenbaum. Century, Vol. 105, April 1923, p. 873-82.

### **Affirmative References**

Current Opinion, Vol. 71, p. 561. Harper's Weekly, Feb. 8, 1908, p. 14. Independent, Vol. 109, p. 333. Literary Digest, Oct. 1, 1921, p. 30; Nov. 11, 1922, p. 13; Nov. 25, 1922, p. 33; Dec.



23, 1922, p. 31; Feb. 3, 1923, p. 20. New Republic, Vol. 25, p. 195; Vol. 33, p. 189. Outlook, Vol. 129, p. 46; Vol. 132, p. 643.

### **Negative References**

Literary Digest, Sept. 24, 1921, p. 34; Aug. 5, 1922, p. 14; Jan. 20, 1923, p. 18. Metropolitan Magazine, Vol. 22, p. 657. New Republic, Vol. 33, p. 289. A. B. C. of the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, Ku Klux Press, Atlanta, Ga., and other pamphlets from the Ku Klux Press.

*Resolved, That the United States should Adopt a Cabinet Form of Government Modeled after that of Great Britain.*

### **Affirmative**

I. It would improve the executive department.

II. The cabinet system would give a proper balance between the executive and legislative departments.

III. The cabinet system has been proven to be satisfactory.

### **Negative**

I. Serious executive problems are found in connection with the cabinet form of government.

II. Our own form of government has so much to commend it that it is being taken as a model by many new republics.

III. For a system to be satisfactory in Great Britain is not evidence that it would be satisfactory here since we have a different foundation on which our government rests.

### **Special Articles**

American Cabinet. A. Maurice Low. Harper's Weekly, August 17, 1912, p. 20.

Cabinet and the Empire. W. J. Courthope. Living Age, Vol. 282, August 15, 1914, p. 423-28.

Comparison Between Cabinet and Presidential Government. A. V. Dicey. Nineteenth Century, Vol. 85, January 1919, p. 25-42.

Congress and the President. R. Young. Ladies Home Journal, August 1920, p. 94-97.

Powers of the President. William H. Taft. Yale Review, October 1914, p. 25-42.

Shall Cabinet Members Talk in Congress? Literary Digest, July 8, 1922, p. 10.

### **Affirmative References**

Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 115, p. 672. Forum, Vol. 61, p. 44. Living Age, Vol. 306, p. 506. Nation, Vol. 96, p. 380; Vol. 110, p. 254. Nineteenth Century, Vol. 87, p. 895. World's Work, Vol. 40, p. 69.

### **Negative References**

Edinburgh Review, Vol. 230, p. 358. Fortnightly Review, Vol. 117, p. 744. Nation, Vol.

109, p. 743; Vol. 110, p. 73. Nineteenth Century, Vol. 85, p. 25. North American Review, Vol. 212, p. 289.

*Resolved, That the President should be Elected by the Direct Vote of the People.*

### **Affirmative**

I. It would eliminate the unnecessary electoral college.

II. The will of the people is not always the governing factor in presidential elections under the present system.

III. Direct elections are in keeping with the principles of a democratic form of government.

### **Negative**

I. The president has a dignified position and should be elected in a dignified manner.

II. The present method of electing does not permit one district to dominate over others.

III. There is no reason to believe that better presidents would be elected by a direct vote.

### **Special Articles**

Direct Elections and the Presidency. F. Franklin. Independent, Vol. 109, December 23, 1922, p. 376-77.

Electoral System. Nation, Vol. 103, November 30, 1916, p. 501-2.

Twentieth Amendment. C. DeW. Pugsley. Independent, Vol. 105, February 26, 1921, p. 209.

### **Affirmative References**

Forum, Vol. 40, p. 470. Independent, Vol. 105, p. 209. Magazine American History, Vol. 14, p. 181. North American Review, Vol. 125, p. 69; Vol. 171, p. 281; Vol. 180, p. 9. Nation, Vol. 16, p. 4; Vol. 17, p. 124. Outlook, Vol. 90, p. 299. Review of Reviews, Vol. 30, p. 352; Vol. 31, p. 31; Vol. 37, p. 331; Vol. 39, p. 34.

### **Negative References**

American Law Review, Vol. 12, p. 1. Independent, Vol. 52, p. 1292; Vol. 109, p. 376. International, Vol. 5, p. 198. North American Review, Vol. 171, p. 273. Political Science Quarterly, Vol. 19, p. 19; Vol. 22, p. 146. Scribner's Magazine, Vol. 27, p. 643.

*Resolved, That the Direct Primary is the Preferable Method for Selecting Candidates to Office.*

### **Affirmative**

I. It is democratic.

II. It is a political weapon of defense by which the voters may protect themselves.

III. It permits any person to seek office on his own merits.

IV. In practice it has kept the political bosses from controlling the selection of candidates.

### Negative

I. The double election increases the public cost.

II. The primary fails for lack of interest on the part of voters.

III. It places a heavy burden of expense on the office seeker.

IV. In practice it does not put real intellectual men into office.

### Special Articles

Direct Primary. J. F. Salter. *Annals of the American Academy*, Vol. 106, March 1923, p. 1-273.

Direct Primaries. J. B. W. Gardiner. *Forum*, Vol. 65, February 1921, p. 206-16.

Direct Primary and the Preferential Method. K. A. Bickel. *Review of Reviews*, Vol. 48, p. 596.

Home Rule and Direct Primaries. J. F. Hylan. *Forum*, Vol. 68, September 1922, p. 791-800.

Presidential Primary. W. G. Brown. *Forum*, Vol. 69, p. 1509-13.

Primary as the Rich Man's Game. *Literary Digest*, June 17, 1922, p. 10.

### Affirmative References

*Annals of the American Academy*, Vol. 20, p. 640; Vol. 25, p. 203. *Forum*, Vol. 42, p. 493; Vol. 65, p. 96; Vol. 68, p. 791; Vol. 69, p. 1509.

Municipal Affairs, Vol. 2, p. 177. Nation, Vol. 98, p. 133. Outlook, Vol. 57, p. 943; Vol. 58, p. 261; Vol. 67, p. 477; Vol. 88, p. 342; Vol. 90, p. 51 and 383; Vol. 91, p. 370; Vol. 95, p. 131; Vol. 97, p. 426 and 945; Vol. 104, p. 353 and 555. Review of Reviews, Vol. 35, p. 748; Vol. 38, p. 399; Vol. 39, p. 274; Vol. 41, p. 597; Vol. 46, p. 439; Vol. 47, p. 682.

### Negative References

The American Caucus System. Geo. W. Lawton.

Readings on Parties and Elections. C. L. Jones.

Arena, Vol. 17, p. 1013; Vol. 30, p. 295; Vol. 55, p. 291. Fortnightly Review, Vol. 30, p. 721. Forum, Vol. 42, p. 493; Vol. 50, p. 48; Vol. 65, p. 90 and 206. Literary Digest, June 17, 1922, p. 10. Nation, Vol. 105, p. 336; Vol. 106, p. 313. New Republic, Vol. 7, p. 65 and 201. North American Review, Vol. 190, p. 222. Outlook, Vol. 59, p. 797; Vol. 70, p. 745; Vol. 89, p. 965; Vol. 95, p. 131. Review of Reviews, Vol. 24, p. 465.

*Resolved, That Judges should be Subject to Recall.*

### Affirmative

I. Judges who prove to be unfit for the office should be removed.

II. When judges are directly answerable to the people they give more consideration to the decisions rendered.

III. The recall does not hurt the good judge, but it does protect the public from the evils of allowing a bad judge to continue in office.

### **Negative**

I. The recall makes the judge's office subject to the whims and fancies of the popular mind.

II. Judges subject to recall hesitate to make unpopular decisions even when they believe that such decisions are right.

III. The recall is unnecessary if a judge actually misuses the power of his office.

### **Special Articles**

Charter of Democracy. Theodore Roosevelt. Outlook, Vol. 100, p. 397.

Recall of Judges. Public, Vol. 22, September 13, 1919, p. 974.

The Recall of Judges. W. H. Taft. Outlook, Vol. 100, p. 604.

### **Affirmative References**

Annals of the American Academy, Vol. 43, p. 286. Case and Comment, Vol. 18, p. 314. Forum, Vol. 47, p. 157. Outlook, Vol. 91, p. 563; Vol. 98, p. 378; Vol. 99, p. 95; Vol. 100, p. 40. Public, Vol. 14, p. 146 and 1235; Vol. 15, p. 125, 145 and

553; Vol. 17, p. 752. Twentieth Century, Vol. 4, p. 551. Survey, Vol. 27, p. 1891. Yale Law Journal, Vol. 21, p. 655.

### Negative References

Annals of the American Academy, Vol. 43, p. 239 and 278. Case and Comment, Vol. 18, p. 308. Century, Vol. 82, p. 624; Vol. 84, p. 15. Forum, Vol. 48, p. 294. Green Bag, Vol. 23, p. 214; Vol. 24, p. 156. Independent, Vol. 61, p. 884; Vol. 71, p. 384; Vol. 72, p. 704 and 1126. Nation, Vol. 85, p. 296; Vol. 97, p. 72. North American Review, Vol. 193, p. 9; Vol. 196, p. 20. Outlook, Vol. 98, p. 852 and 912; Vol. 100, p. 522 and 604. Yale Law Journal, Vol. 21, p. 372; Vol. 22, p. 1.

*Resolved, That Capital Punishment should be Abolished.*

### Affirmative

I. Capital punishment is wrong in principle, it is revenge rather than punishment.

II. Capital punishment is opposed to modern civilization.

III. Capital punishment does not promote reform.

### Negative

I. Society is endangered when capital punishment is abolished.



II. Murders increase where capital punishment is abolished.

III. Capital punishment is best for the reformation of criminal tendencies.

### **Special Articles**

Capital Punishment. M. M. I. Robespierre. World's Best Orations, Vol. 9, p. 3326.

Capital Punishment and Prison Reforms. Survey, Vol. 37, March 10, 1917, p. 670-71.

Death by Law. H. L. Davis. Outlook, Vol. 131, July 26, 1922, p. 525-28.

Plea to Women. Freeman, Vol. 6, February 21, 1923, p. 557.

Why the People of Arizona Voted to Keep Their Public Hangman. Survey, Vol. 33, February 27, 1915, p. 585.

### **Affirmative References**

American Magazine, Vol. 77, p. 77. American Law Review, Vol. 41, p. 561; Vol. 43, p. 321. Arena, Vol. 1, p. 175; Vol. 2, p. 513; Vol. 38, p. 259; Vol. 41, p. 525. Cosmopolitan, Vol. 50, p. 704. Current Literature, Vol. 29, p. 190. Green Bag, Vol. 10, p. 92; Vol. 19, p. 359. Freeman, Vol. 6, p. 557. Harper's Weekly, Vol. 48, p. 196; Vol. 50, p. 1028; Vol. 51, p. 890. Independent, Vol. 61, p. 1124; Vol. 74, p. 830. North American Review, Vol. 62, p. 40; Vol. 116, p. 138; Vol. 133, p. 550. Outlook, Vol. 90, p. 1; Vol. 114, p.

388; Vol. 116, p. 19. Public, Vol. 10, p. 102; Vol. 17, p. 472. Review of Reviews, Vol. 34, p. 368; Vol. 40, p. 219. Survey, Vol. 39, p. 673. Westminster Review, Vol. 81, p. 185; Vol. 91, p. 34; Vol. 155, p. 144; Vol. 168, p. 178; Vol. 170, p. 325; Vol. 172, p. 96; Vol. 176, p. 177.

### Negative References

Murder and the Death Penalty. W. H. Thompson.

American Magazine, Vol. 77, p. 75. Annals of the American Academy, Vol. 29, p. 622. Arena, Vol. 21, p. 469. Blackwood's Magazine, Vol. 27, p. 865; Vol. 58, p. 129. Forum, Vol. 3, p. 381. Nation, Vol. 8, p. 166; Vol. 16, p. 193; Vol. 24, p. 263. North American Review, Vol. 133, p. 534. Outlook, Vol. 114, p. 360; Vol. 116, p. 18; Vol. 131, p. 525. Review of Reviews, Vol. 21, p. 608. Spectator, Vol. 105, p. 1017. Survey, Vol. 33, p. 585. Westminster Review, Vol. 170, p. 91.

*Resolved, That Pensions should be Paid from State Funds to Mothers of Dependent Children.*

### Affirmative

I. Mothers' pensions enable mothers to maintain home life when it would be otherwise impossible.

II. The policy is economically sound.

III. It promotes the best interests of society.

### Negative

I. The policy invites abuse of privileges.

II. When pensions are paid individual responsibility is lessened.

III. Acceptance of pensions lessens family self respect and standing in society.

### Special Articles

Aid to Mothers with Dependent Children. E. O. Lundberg. *Annals of the American Academy*, Vol. 98, November 1921, p. 97-105.

Great Economy of Adequate Grants. M. F. Bogue. *Proceedings, National Conference of Social Work*, 1919, p. 303-8.

Philadelphia's Experience with Mother's Pensions. *World's Work*, Vol. 34, August 1917, p. 365-66.

Public Pensions to Widows with Children. Edith Abbott. *American Economical Review*, Vol. 3, p. 473.

Ten Years of Mothers' Pensions. M. F. Bogue. *Survey*, Vol. 49, February 15, 1923, p. 634-36.

Wildfire Spread of Mothers' Pensions. *Everybody's Magazine*, Vol. 32, p. 780.

### Affirmative References

Prevention of Destitution. Sidney Webb. *American Child*, Vol. 3, p. 24. *Child Welfare Magazine*, Vol. 7, p. 248. *Delineator*, Vol.

80, p. 85; Vol. 81, p. 19; Vol. 82, p. 355. Good Housekeeping, Vol. 52, p. 282. Proceedings National Conference of Social Work, 1919, p. 303; 1921, p. 234. Survey, Vol. 29, p. 769; Vol. 32, p. 331; Vol. 43, p. 648; Vol. 48, p. 716; Vol. 49, p. 634.

### **Negative References**

American Labor Legislation Review, Vol. 3, p. 191 and 229. Survey, Vol. 29, p. 459; Vol. 32, p. 23. Proceedings of the 1912 National Conference of Charities and Correction.

*Resolved, That Moving Pictures should be Suppressed.*

### **Affirmative**

I. Moving pictures misrepresent life, creating wrong impressions.

II. They make an improper appeal.

III. They tend toward a general lowering of ideals, young people being especially influenced during the formative period of their lives.

### **Negative**

I. Moving pictures meet a legitimate demand for entertainment.

II. Movies are educationally valuable, being used in the best schools of the country.

III. There are bad moving pictures as there are bad books, but all should not be suppressed be-

cause some are bad any more than books should be suppressed because some are not fit to read.

### Special Articles

American Films Corrupting Britain. Literary Digest, December 4, 1920, p. 34.

Better Films a Community Asset. A. S. Richardson. Woman's Home Companion, January 1923, p. 17.

Censor and the Movie Menace. E. P. Oberholtzer. North American Review, Vol. 212, November 1920, p. 641-47.

Moving Pictures and Crime. A. T. Poffenberger. Scientific Monthly, Vol. 12, April 1921, p. 336-39.

Motion Pictures and the Schools. School and Society, Vol. 17, April 28, 1923, p. 459-60.

Motion Picture Industry. W. R. Hays. Review of Reviews, Vol. 67, January 1923, p. 65-80.

Movies—Bane or Blessing? C. W. Crumly. Education, Vol. 40, December 1919, p. 199-213.

Movie Volcano. Literary Digest, November 19, 1921, p. 23.

We Have Come to Stay. C. Chaplin. Ladies Home Journal, October 1922, p. 12.

What are the Movies Making of Our Children? E. P. Oberholtzer. World's Work, Vol. 41, January 1921, p. 249-63.

## PROS AND CONS

Wholesome Movies for Church and School.  
Literary Digest, October 21, 1922, p. 35.

### Affirmative References

Collier's Weekly, Sept. 16, 1922, p. 3. Current Opinion, Vol. 70, p. 320 and 362; Vol. 72, p. 353. Fortnightly Review, Vol. 113, p. 717. Forum, Vol. 67, p. 37; Vol. 69, p. 1404. Good Housekeeping, Vol. 76, p. 8. Literary Digest, March 26, 1921, p. 28. North American Review, Vol. 212, p. 641. Outlook, Vol. 133, p. 296. Review of Reviews, Vol. 63, p. 555. World's Work, Vol. 41, p. 249.

### Negative References

Collier's Weekly, Dec. 2, 1922, p. 10. Current Opinion, Vol. 73, p. 67. Forum, Vol. 67, p. 42. Ladies' Home Journal, Sept. 1922, p. 13. Literary Digest, May 1, 1920, p. 36; Oct. 21, 1922, p. 35. Review of Reviews, Vol. 62, p. 107; Vol. 67, p. 65. School and Society, Vol. 16, p. 589. Scientific American, Vol. 122, p. 702. American City, Vol. 21, p. 227.

*Resolved, That Through Appropriate Legislation a Minimum Wage Scale should be Put in Operation in the Several States.*

### Affirmative

I. The minimum wage means a more nearly equitable wage, preventing industrial slavery.

II. It tends to uplift an important element of society.

III. It is just to the worker and fair to the employer.

### **Negative**

I. The minimum wage works a hardship on the small industries.

II. It restricts employment to those best able to earn the established wage.

III. It is a cruelty to aged workers.

### **Books and Special Articles**

Adjustment of Wages. W. J. Ashley.

Problems of Today. Andrew Carnegie.

The Standard of Living. R. C. Chapin.

Enforcement of Minimum Wage Decrees in Massachusetts. Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 15, November 1922, p. 1073-76.

Is the Minimum Wage Unconstitutional? F. Kelley. Survey, Vol. 50, April 15, 1923, p. 74.

Minimum Wage: Symposium. Catholic World, Vol. 117, May 1923, p. 200-13.

Minimum Wage Legislation Under Review. H. Feis. Survey, Vol. 48, September 15, 1922, p. 720-21.

Minimum Wage in Canada. K. Derry and P. H. Douglas. Journal of Political Economics, Vol. 30, April 1922, p. 155-88.

Minimum Wage in Great Britain. R. H. Tawney. New Republic, Vol. 31, June 28, 1922, p. 125-27.

Protection or Justice. Freeman, Vol. 7, April 15, 1923, p. 148.

Protecting Women Workers. Outlook, Vol. 133, February 21, 1923, p. 339.

Two Views on the Minimum Wage. Survey, Vol. 33, March 6, 1915, p. 601.

### **Affirmative References**

Annals of the American Academy, Vol. 90, p. 70. Freeman, Vol. 7, p. 148. Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 15, p. 1073. Consult other issues of the Monthly Labor Review. New Republic, Vol. 34, p. 228 and 240. Outlook, Vol. 133, p. 694. Survey, Vol. 48, p. 242.

### **Negative References**

Consult issues of the Monthly Labor Review. Catholic World, Vol. 117, p. 200. Independent, Vol. 80, p. 409. Outlook, Vol. 133, p. 694. Survey, Vol. 33, p. 601; Vol. 34, p. 122; Vol. 39, p. 372.























